



FUNDING GUIDELINES PEER PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND

MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND

March 2004

MARYLAND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION
839 Bestgate Rd. • Suite 400 • Annapolis, MD 21401-3013

MARYLAND HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION

John J. Oliver, Jr., Chairman

Donald J. Slowinski, Sr., Vice Chairman

Joann A. Boughman

Aja Campbell

Edward O. Clarke, Jr.

Anne Osborn Emery

Ilona Modly Hogan

Emmett Paige, Jr.

Hoke L. Smith

Richard P. Streett, Jr.

Mario VillaSanta

Calvin W. Burnett
Acting Secretary of Higher Education

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Background	2
Refining Funding Guidelines	2
Performance Measures	3
Assessing Institution Performance	3
Data Availability	4
St. Mary's College of Maryland Quality Profile	4
Peer Performance Analysis	
Bowie State University	15
Coppin State College	19
Frostburg State University	23
Salisbury University	29
Towson University	33
University of Baltimore	39
University of Maryland, Baltimore	43
University of Maryland Baltimore County	47
University of Maryland, College Park	51
University of Maryland Eastern Shore	57
University of Maryland University College	61
Morgan State University	65
St. Mary's College of Maryland	69
Appendices	
Appendix A. Methodology For Selecting Performance Peers At The University System Of Maryland Institutions	77
Appendix B. Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators: University System of Maryland	79
Appendix C. Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators: Morgan State University	87
Appendix D. Operational Definitions for Performance Indicators: Morgan State University	91

Executive Summary

In September 1999, the Maryland Higher Education Commission adopted a peer-based model for the establishment of funding guidelines for the University System of Maryland and Morgan State University. The guidelines are designed to inform the budget process by providing both a funding standard and a basis for comparison between institutions. The basic concept of the funding guidelines is to identify peer institutions that are similar to Maryland institutions on a variety of characteristics. These “funding peers” are compared to the Maryland institutions to inform resource questions and assess performance.

Included in the funding guidelines process is an annual performance accountability component. Each applicable Maryland institution selects 10 “performance peers” from their list of “funding peers.” The Commission, in consultation with representatives from the University System of Maryland, Morgan State University, the Department of Budget and Management and the Department of Legislative Services, identified a set of comprehensive, outcome-oriented performance measures to compare Maryland institutions against their performance peers. There are 15 measures for USM institutions and 14 for Morgan. These indicators are consistent with the State’s Managing for Results (MFR) initiative and include indicators for which data are currently available. In some instances, institutions added specific indicators that were more reflective of the institution’s role and mission.

Maryland institutions are expected to perform at or above their performance peers on most indicators. Furthermore, Commission staff assessed the institutions’ performance within the context of the State’s MFR initiative. Commission staff examined trend data and benchmarks for indicators that are comparable to the peer performance indicators. In instances where an institution’s performance is below the performance of its peers, the institution was required to identify actions that it will take to improve performance. An exception was made for an institution that demonstrates progress towards achieving its benchmarks on related indicators established within the MFR initiative.

St. Mary’s College of Maryland participates in the performance assessment process despite the fact that it does not participate in the funding guidelines. St. Mary’s has selected twelve current peers and six aspirant peers on which to base performance. The 23 performance measures are similar to those chosen for the other four-year public institutions and also reflect St. Mary’s role as the State’s only public liberal arts college.

This report contains a comprehensive assessment of the performance of each University System of Maryland institution, Morgan State University and St. Mary’s College of Maryland in comparison to their performance peers. The report includes a discussion of the performance measures, criteria used to assess institutional performance, and issues related to data availability. In addition, each institution will be given an opportunity to respond to the Commission’s assessment of its performance in comparison to its peers. Institutional responses and comments are summarized in the analysis section.

Background

In September 1999, the Maryland Higher Education Commission adopted funding guidelines; a peer-based model designed to inform the budget process by providing both a funding standard and a basis for comparison between institutions. The basic concept of the funding guidelines is to identify peer institutions (i.e. "funding peers") that are similar to the Maryland institution (i.e. "home" institution) in mission, size, program mix, enrollment composition, and other defining characteristics. These funding peers are then compared and contrasted with the Maryland institution.

One component critical in determining whether the State's higher education institutions are performing at the level of their funding peers is performance accountability. To compare performance, the presidents of each Maryland institution (except the University of Maryland, College Park; University of Maryland, Baltimore; and Morgan State University) selected ten "performance" peers from their list of "funding" peers. The presidents based this selection on criteria relevant to their specific institutional objectives. The University of Maryland, College Park is measured only against its 'aspirational peers' - those institutions that College Park aspires to emulate in performance and reputation. For the University of Maryland, Baltimore (UMB), "composite peers" are used to recognize UMB's status as the State's public academic health and law university with six professional schools. UMB's peers include institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as "specialized" and institutions classified as "Research I" institutions. Morgan State University's performance peers are the same as its funding peers. Appendix A lists the criteria used by each institution to select their performance peers.

Refining Funding Guidelines

In fiscal year 2002, for the first time, the Commission provided a report to the General Assembly on the University System of Maryland's performance relative to their performance peers. The budget committees expressed concern that this report was not comprehensive because the performance indicators did not place enough emphasis on outcome and achievement measures. The committees requested that the Commission address this gap by developing more comprehensive and outcome-oriented accountability indicators.

The Commission, in consultation with the representatives from the University System of Maryland, the Department of Budget and Management, the Department of Legislative Services and Morgan State University, established a workgroup to address the gap in the peer performance component of the funding guidelines. Based on collaborative decisions, the workgroup identified a set of performance measures to compare Maryland institutions against their "performance" peers. In addition, the workgroup developed a method to assess institutional performance.

Fiscal year 2004 represented the fourth year the funding guidelines influenced the allocation of State resources. As funding guidelines continue to evolve, so too does the assessment of institutional performance. This report contains the third comprehensive assessment of the performance of each University System of Maryland institution and Morgan State University and the second for St. Mary's College of Maryland in comparison to their performance peers. A discussion of the performance measures, criteria used to assess institutional performance, and issues related to data availability follow.

Performance Measures

For the University System of Maryland institutions, there are 15 performance measures (see Table 1). Not all institutions are required to provide data on all of the measures. There are separate sets of indicators for Maryland's comprehensive institutions and for the research universities. Furthermore, institutions have the flexibility to add specific indicators that are more reflective of their role and mission. The indicators include retention and graduation rates, and outcome measures such as licensure examination passing rates, the number of faculty awards, and student and employer satisfaction rates. All indicators are consistent with the State's Managing for Results (MFR) initiative and reflect statewide policy goals. Appendix B lists the operational definitions for each indicator.

There are 14 performance measures for Morgan State University (see Table 2). These indicators include retention and graduation rates, student and employer satisfaction rates, and the passing rate on the Praxis II examination (an assessment that measures teacher candidates' knowledge of the subjects that they will teach). Appendix C lists the operational definitions for Morgan's indicators.

Assessing Institution Performance

Maryland institutions are expected to perform at or above their performance peers on most indicators. Furthermore, Commission staff assessed institutional performance within the context of the State's MFR initiative. In general, institutions were expected to make progress towards achieving their benchmarks established within the MFR initiative. Commission staff examined trend data and benchmarks for indicators that are comparable to the peer performance indicators. In instances where an institution's performance is below the performance of its peers, the institution is required to identify actions that it will take to improve performance. An exception will be made for an institution that demonstrates progress towards achieving its benchmarks on related indicators established within the MFR initiative.

For this report, each institution was given an opportunity to respond to the Commission's assessment of its performance in comparison to its peers. Institutional responses and comments are summarized in the analysis section of this report.

Data Availability

It should be noted that it was difficult to obtain nationally comparable outcome-based performance measures. To the extent possible, the measures identified for peer comparisons use data that are verifiable and currently available from national data systems such as the National Center for Education Statistics' Integrated Postsecondary Education Database Systems (IPEDS), the National Science Foundation, and *U.S. News and World Report*. Although the National Center for Education Statistics is currently in the process of designing methods to gather outcome-based indicators, many of these data are not readily available. For example, peer data are not available for alumni giving, graduate satisfaction, employers' satisfaction, and passing rates on several professional licensure examinations. In cases where data are not available through national data systems, Maryland institutions obtained data either directly from their peer institutions or compared its performance to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification.

It should be noted that for one measure, the pass rate on the Praxis II examination, research suggests that comparisons of pass rates across state lines is not advisable because of major differences in the testing requirements from one state to another. Since each state independently determines the level of performance required for teacher certification, this indicator is useful only for comparing institutional performance to other Maryland institutions.

In addition, there are subtle differences between the operational definitions found in this analysis and the definitions used in the MFR for several performance indicators. For example, in this analysis, the second-year retention rate and the six-year graduation rate measures the proportion of first-time, full-time degree seeking undergraduate students who either returned to or graduated from the same college or university. In addition, the graduation data used in this analysis are based on the Federal Graduation Rate Survey (GRS), a federal initiative that collects data required by the Student Right-to-Know Act of 1990. In contrast, the MFR captures students who re-enroll or graduate from the same institution as well as those students who transfer to any Maryland public four-year institution. Because of these subtle differences, it was not possible to assess institutional performance on retention and graduation within the context of the MFR initiative.

Despite the overall difficulties in obtaining nationally comparable performance measures, institutions were expected to take appropriate steps to collect data on all performance measures. In the analysis section of this report, institutions were asked to identify actions that they are taking to collect data.

St. Mary's College of Maryland Quality Profile

St. Mary's College of Maryland's general fund appropriation is determined by a statutory formula and not through the funding guideline process. However, the College expressed

interest in providing a set of institutions for the purpose of assessing its performance as the State's only public liberal arts college. Due to its unique characteristic as a public, liberal arts college offering only Baccalaureate degrees, St. Mary's is categorized as a Baccalaureate I institution. Of the approximately 163 institutions in this category, only a small number of institutions are public. Therefore, along with a small group of public institutions with a liberal arts mission, a comparison group for St. Mary's includes private institutions.

St. Mary's peer group includes twelve "current" peers and six "aspirant" peers. The aspirant peers represent those institutions that St. Mary's aspires to emulate in performance and reputation. Of the twelve current peers, four are public. All of the aspirant peers are private institutions.

The college used the following attributes to identify similar institutions: size; minority enrollment; distribution of bachelor's and master's degrees awarded; distribution of degrees awarded by broad discipline area; proportion of part-time students; location; tuition and fees; and revenue and expenditure data. In addition, St. Mary's examined additional factors to select its peers including: the academic attributes of new freshmen; the proportion of graduates pursuing graduate or professional education; the existence of a senior project requirement; and the value of the institution's endowment. Further, the college chose performance measures that mirrored those chosen by the other State public institutions as well as measures that reflect St. Mary's particular role in the State's system of higher education.

There are 23 performance measures for St. Mary's College of Maryland including many descriptive indicators in addition to qualitative ones (see Table 3). These indicators include retention and graduation rates, faculty salaries, student/faculty ratio and library holdings. Appendix D details the operational definitions.

**TABLE 1. UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND
PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR FUNDING GUIDELINES**

Performance Indicator	BSU	CSC	FSU	SU	TU	UB	UMB	UMBC	UMCP	UMES	UMJC
1. Average SAT score of incoming students ¹	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
2. % minority of all undergraduates	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
3. % African-American of all undergrads.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
4. Second year retention rate	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
5. Six year graduation rate	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
6. Six year graduation rate: all minorities	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
7. Six year graduation rate: African-Am.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
8. Pass rate on Praxis II exam	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
9. Passing rate in nursing licensing exam							•				
10. Passing rates in other licensure exams ²						Law	Med Law Dent. SW				
11. Average alumni giving rate/average undergrad alumni giving	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
12. Total R&D expenditures ³											
13. Average annual % growth in federal R&D expenditures ³											
14. \$s in total R&D expenditures per FT faculty ³	•										
15. # of faculty awards per 100 faculty						•					
16. Institution-specific measures	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•

¹ Institutions have the option of using the 25th and 75th percentile of SAT score for entering freshmen.

² For some licensing examinations, overall Maryland passing rate may be the appropriate reference rather than the peer institutions

³ Comparable peer data are not available. Data for USM institutions.

⁴ University of North Carolina System's schools will be used for peer comparison

⁵ For institutions other than UMB, peer's medical R&D expenditures will be excluded.

**TABLE 2. MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR FUNDING GUIDELINES**

Measure ¹	Comparison Group
1. Second year retention rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time undergraduates	National Peers
2. Second year retention rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time African American undergraduates	National Peers
3. Second year retention rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time minority undergraduates	National Peers
4. Six-year graduation rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time undergraduates	National Peers
5. Six-year graduation rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time, African American undergraduates	National Peers
6. Six-year graduation rate of a cohort of first-time, full-time, minority, undergraduates	National Peers
7. Percent increase in doctoral degrees awarded over base year FY1999	National Peers
8. Graduate/professional school going rate	National Peers, if available, else appropriate Maryland institutions
9. Satisfaction with advanced studies preparation	National Peers, if available, else appropriate Maryland institutions
10. Satisfaction with job preparation	National Peers, if available, else appropriate Maryland institutions
11. PRAXIS II pass rate	National Peers, if available, else appropriate Maryland institutions
12. Summary measure of employer satisfaction	National Peers, if available, else appropriate Maryland institutions
13. Alumni giving	National Peers, if available, else appropriate Maryland institutions
14. Percent growth in grants and contracts expenditures	National Peers, if available, else appropriate Maryland institutions

¹ For all measures, the most recent data available was used.

**TABLE 3. ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND
PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR PEER ANALYSIS**

Measure ¹
1. Amount in total R&D spending
2. Percent of faculty with terminal degrees
3. Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank
4. Percentile of full-time instructional faculty by rank
5. Average SAT scores of entering freshmen
6. 25th - 75th percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen
7. Acceptance Rate
8. Yield Ratio
9. Second year retention rate
10. Average six-year graduation rate
11. Six-year graduation rate for African-American students
12. Total headcount enrollment
13. Percent Minorities of total headcount enrollment
14. Percent full-time undergraduates of total headcount enrollment
15. Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment
16. Annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduates
17. Percent of full-time freshmen receiving aid from federal grants
18. E&G expenditures per full-time equivalent student
19. Average alumni giving rate
20. Tuition and fees revenues a percent of E&G expenditures
21. Ratio of full-time equivalent students to full-time faculty
22. Academic library holdings
23. Academic library expenditures per full-time equivalent student

¹ For all measures, the most recent data available was used.

Peer Performance Analysis

Bowie State University

Bowie State University exceeds the performance of its peers on several performance measures. The university's six-year graduation rate significantly exceeds the average of its peer institutions. Furthermore, only two of its peers have a higher second-year retention rate than Bowie. The percentage of minority and African-American undergraduate students attending the institution exceeds the peer average. These student populations also have higher six-year graduation rates than its peers.

Bowie selected four institution-specific indicators: the percent of faculty with terminal degrees; acceptance rate; yield rate (enrollment rate); and research and development (R&D) expenditures per full-time faculty. The university's level of expenditures for research and development per full-time faculty fell slightly from the previous year, but still significantly exceeds the peer average and is higher than most of its peers. In this case, however, only four of its peers reported expenditures in this area. Bowie's average acceptance rate is 53 percent; a figure below the peer average of 69 percent.

The university reports a 98 percent pass rate on the Praxis exam, representing a slight decrease from last year's rate. Additionally, the university's alumni giving rate is slightly higher than average. The institution reports two years of solid growth in this indicator.

There are, however, a few cases where the institution performs below the level of its peers. The university's yield rate (or enrollment rate) is among the lowest of its peers at 30 percent. This rate is higher, however, than last year's rate of 23 percent. Furthermore, the percentage of faculty at Bowie with terminal degrees is 68 percent compared to the average of its peers, 76 percent. According to MFR data, 82 percent of full-time core faculty has terminal degrees. But this number has not improved over the last four years.

In many cases, Commission staff was unable to compare the performance of Bowie relative to its peers due to missing data for a number of measures. For example, data for the graduation rate category are not available for five of Bowie's peers. It should be noted, however, that reporting of Praxis exam pass rates was much improved over the prior year.

The Institution's Response

In addition to researching available data from the National Center for Education Statistics' Integrated Postsecondary Education Database Systems (IPEDS), the institution's Office of Planning, Analysis and Accountability (OPAA) has engaged in an extensive data collection process with its peer institutions. Bowie has formalized procedures that includes both written and oral communications, data templates, and developed a timeline for implementation. The institution continues to refine this notification and collection process with the expectation that it will yield more data.

Bowie also anticipates improvement in its performance in yield rate through creative recruitment initiatives. In addition, the institution expects to improve its percentage of faculty with terminal degrees by hiring faculty members with terminal degrees or those very close to terminal degree completion.

Bowie State University

Peer Performance Data, 2003

Institution	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African- American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African-Americans
Bowie State U.	825-975	91.7%	88.8%	72%	40%	34%	42%
Auburn U., Montgomery	reports ACT	35.1%	31.7%	NA	NA	NA	NA
California State U. Bakersfield	820-1060	45.6%	6.8%	78%	41%	36%	21%
Cheyney U. of Penn.	NA	94.9%	93.8%	62%	NA	NA	NA
Columbus State U.	870-1070	33.8%	28.2%	64%	23%	15%	13%
Georgia C. & State U.	980-1140	13.8%	11.8%	72%	NA	NA	NA
New Jersey City U.	770-990	62.3%	20.5%	73%	31%	58%	27%
Prairie View A & M U.	660-900	95.3%	92.4%	68%	NA	NA	NA
Sul Ross State U.	NA	61.5%	2.9%	51%	15%	18%	10%
Virginia State U.	710-890	97.4%	96.1%	71%	41%	41%	41%
Western New Mexico U.	NA	52.7%	1.9%	52%	NA	NA	NA
Average of Peers	802-1008	59.2%	38.6%	65.7%	30%	34%	22%

-17-

Institution	Passing rate on teacher licensure exams	BSU institution-specific indicators			Yield rate	R&D expenditures per FT faculty (\$000)
		Alumni giving rate	% of faculty with terminal degree	Acceptance rate		
Bowie State U.	98%	13.0%	68%	53%	30%	\$ 20,248
Auburn U., Montgomery	100%	38.0%	57%	98%	NA	-
California State U. Bakersfield	94%	10.5%	98%	61%	48%	18,063
Cheyney U. of Penn.	56%	3.4%	NA	NA	26%	-
Columbus State U.	98%	11.3%	70%	70%	60%	-
Georgia C. & State U.	100%	NA	74%	68%	30%	-
New Jersey City U.	94%	6.3%	70%	53%	30%	-
Prairie View A & M U.	80%	4.7%	72%	NA	63%	53,540
Sul Ross State U.	88%	NA	72%	NA	53%	8,376
Virginia State U.	*	NA	82%	66%	46%	29,976
Western New Mexico U.	100%	NA	85%	NA	27%	-
Average of Peers	90%	12.4%	76%	69%	43%	\$ 10,996

N/A - Data not available

* Scores not reported because there are fewer than 10 test takers.

8/6/2003

Coppin State College

Compared to its peers, Coppin State College has the highest second-year retention rate. Although the rate has fallen slightly, it remains significantly higher than the rate of its peers. Furthermore, Coppin has made strides in the graduation rates of minorities, while its peers have not progressed in this area. This increase may be due to several retention initiatives implemented by the college. In addition, the percentage of minority and African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is well above the peer average.

Conversely, the college performs below the average of its peers on a few of its performance measures. Coppin ranks among the lowest in SAT scores for entering freshmen. In terms of the college's effectiveness in preparing nursing students, Coppin is below the peer average in the percentage of students passing the nursing exam. While the institution has improved in this indicator over the last two years, it has not yet returned to the level it was in 1998. Also, Coppin trails its peers significantly in graduation rates for African-Americans. However, the institution has closed the gap a bit by increasing their rate, while the average of its peers has fallen.

The college added five institution-specific indicators: percent of undergraduates attending part-time; percent of graduate students enrolled; unrestricted, non-auxiliary revenue as a percent of total unrestricted revenue; the average age of full-time undergraduates; and the proportion of commuter students. Although these are primarily descriptive measures, they provide an indication of the type of student population attending the institution. For example, approximately 26 percent of Coppin's student population attends part-time which is slightly higher than its peer average. Furthermore, the average age for full-time undergraduate students is 24, slightly higher than the peer average and compared to its peers, the vast majority of the students commute. The percentage of graduate students attending the institution is relatively low. Compared to its peers, the proportion of graduate students is slightly lower than the peer average.

In a few cases, it is difficult for Commission staff to compare the performance of Coppin relative to its peers due to the number of missing data. For example, Coppin has a higher than average alumni giving rate, yet data are not available for four of its peers. It should be noted, however, that reporting of this element is much improved over the prior year. For the percentage of students passing the nursing exam, data are not available for three of Coppin's peer institutions and five peer institutions have no nursing program at all. In addition, data are missing from a number of peer institutions on the six-year graduation rate for all minorities and African-American students.

The Institution's Response

A campus-wide Retention Committee has developed recommendations for improving the six-year graduation rate for all students. For Academic Year 2004-2005, the Retention Committee recommended the need for a full-time Retention Coordinator, an individual who will work with the academic units and focus on such critical issues as pre-major

advising, general academic advising, a comprehensive advisement plan, training of advisors, personalizing the academic experience for students, and ensuring academic excellence for all students.

To improve the passing rate on the nursing licensing exam, the Division of Nursing implemented several strategies to increase the success rate of its graduates. These strategies include: strengthening the process and appointing a team of faculty to administer the Mosby Assess Test on a consistent basis; holding one-on-one sessions with students with the intent of assisting them with their areas of weakness; reviewing data on students' performance in the review sessions and Mosby Assess Test and making curricular decision during their annual undergraduate curriculum retreat; offering an NCLEX-RN review class for all senior nursing students prior to the administration of the Mosby Assess Test as a predictor of NCLEX success; requiring all graduating senior nursing students to participate in the Educational Resources, Inc. (ERI) "live review" and testing program; developing a personalized program for each student, once students' areas of deficiency are identified; encouraging students to make use of campus resources such as the Division's computer CD-ROM after graduation to assist them with their preparation for the NCLEX; offering a synthesis course for students in the final semester of the program; and administering a comprehensive examination during the student's final semester to assess whether students are ready for the NCLEX-RN.

The college has made a number of efforts to collect peer data. Coppin will continue to administer its annual peer performance survey to its institutional peers. According to the college, six (60%) of the ten peer institutions responded to the annual survey, the highest response rate to date, after numerous follow-up telephone calls and duplicate mailings of the survey instrument. In addition, in fall 2003 Coppin joined the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange, Center for Institutional Data Exchange and Analysis, which collects retention and graduation data from approximately 472 member institutions through the administration of a biannual survey instrument. Each member institution is entitled to an individualized report containing benchmark data of a self-selected peer group.

Coppin State College

Peer Performance Data, 2003

Institution	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority/ of all undergraduates	% African- American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African-Americans	Passing rate on teacher licensure exams
Coppin State C.	750-1050	96.4%	95.4%	72%	30%	29.1%	29.2%	100%
Alabama State U.	reports ACT	94.9%	94.5%	59%	21%	16.0%	21.0%	100%
Alcorn State U.	reports ACT	93.1%	92.7%	72%	47%	1.0%	99.0%	100%
Chicago State U.	reports ACT	94.7%	88.4%	62%	N/A	N/A	N/A	91%
Columbus State U.	870-1070	33.8%	28.2%	64%	23%	15.0%	13.0%	98%
Fort Valley State U.	924-1275	94.9%	94.2%	73%	23%	33.0%	25.4%	100%
New Jersey City U.	770-990	62.3%	20.5%	NA	31%	33.3%	27.0%	94%
New Mexico Highlands U.	N/A	71.1%	3.1%	55%	N/A	N/A	N/A	91%
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	820-1010	47.5%	21.8%	69%	34%	N/A	39.4%	99%
Sul Ross State U.	N/A	61.5%	2.9%	51%	N/A	N/A	N/A	88%
Western New Mexico U.	N/A	52.7%	1.9%	52%	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%
Average of Peers	846-1086	70.7%	44.8%	61.9%	30%	19.7%	37.5%	96%

-21-

Institution	Passing rate in nursing licensing exam	CSC institution-specific indicators					% Commuter students
		Alumni giving rate	Part-time undergrads as % of total undergrad.	Graduate students as % of total headcount	Non-auxiliary revenue as % of total revenue	Average age full-time undergraduate	
Coppin State C.	86%	10.5%	26.0%	16.0%	89.0%	24	85%
Alabama State U.	NP	2.0%	12.0%	15.0%	88.0%	19	61%
Alcorn State U.	92%	6.0%	10.0%	20.0%	84.0%	22	47%
Chicago State U.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	22	N/A
Columbus State U.	95%	11.3%	33.0%	15.0%	N/A	24	88%
Fort Valley State U.	NP	23.0%	7.0%	12.0%	N/A	24	34%
New Jersey City U.	NP	6.3%	34.0%	32.0%	98.0%	23	95%
New Mexico Highlands U.	NP	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	22	N/A
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	N/A	9.4%	30.0%	10.8%	85.0%	22	76%
Sul Ross State U.	NP	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Western New Mexico U.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average of Peers	94%	9.7%	21.0%	17.5%	88.8%	22.3	67%

N/A - Data not available

NP - No program

NR - No requirement

8/18/2003

Frostburg State University

Frostburg State University's performance on a number of performance indicators meets or exceeds its peer average. The percentage of minority and African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is well above its peer average. Despite the fact that Frostburg enrolls students with lower SAT scores than its peers, the university meets the average of its peers in the six-year graduation rate for all students and in second year retention rates. The university also compares favorably in its undergraduate alumni-giving rate. Compared to its peers, Frostburg performs slightly above the average of its peers.

The university performs below the average of its peers on a number of performance measures. Frostburg ranks below its peers average in the six-year graduation rate for minorities and African-Americans. This represents a two-year decline, when the university exceeded its peers in these indicators. Furthermore, MFR data confirm the downward trend for minority and African-American graduation rates.

Frostburg has two institution-specific indicators: student-faculty ratio and percent of faculty with terminal degrees. The university's student-faculty ratio is more favorable than its peer average. Also, Frostburg reports that 80 percent of its faculty had terminal degrees, compared to a peer average of 66 percent. This indicator is newly adopted by the university; therefore, any measure of historical progress is not possible.

On professional licensure examinations, Frostburg continues to have a high proportion of students passing the teacher licensing exam. Many of Frostburg's peer institutions, however, use alternative certification tests. Also, the number of Frostburg students passing the social work licensing exam has fallen from the previous years. A further comparison of this indicator is not possible due to lack of peer institution data and historical data. Since data are not available for any of the peer institutions, Frostburg should reconsider the use of this indicator.

The Institution's Response

Significant efforts have been under way since 1995 to improve the academic characteristics of Frostburg State University first time student cohorts as a way to enhance retention and graduation rates at the University.* The table below demonstrates the increase in the level of academic preparedness of FSU students.

First-Time, Full-Time Freshmen Average Admission GPA and Average SAT-Combined Scores

Term	N	Average GPA	Average SAT
Fall 95	913	2.74	916.2
Fall 00	1031	2.98	996.4
Fall 03	990	3.07	1030

* The FY 2003 Peer Performance Data graduation rates are based on the 1995 first-time full-time student cohort.

In 1996, an ad hoc task force was created to develop a comprehensive retention plan for the University. This task force made several recommendations designed to address retention and graduation rates that focused on improving curricular selections made by students and enhancing academic support, advising, student services, and financial aid. In addition, the University has established a successful learning community program for entering freshman as well as effective student mentoring and monitoring programs. The University has also charged its Vice President for Enrollment Management with the responsibility for coordinating the University's retention effort, which will have a direct impact on graduation rates. More recently the college deans are working directly with academic chairs to shape retention strategies at the departmental level.

The University's Minority Achievement Plan (MAP) attempts to create an environment on campus that enhances the retention and graduation rates of African American and other minority students. The Plan calls for the University to continue a number of important initiatives including its learning community program, residential-based service programs, academic support services, and academic monitoring and new advising programs.

Another important measure taken by the University is the Provost's Undergraduate Education Initiative (UEI). As part of this initiative, a University-wide group on Multiculturalism, Gender, and Internationalization is considering how issues of race, gender, and culture can be assimilated into both the General Education Program and academic degree programs. The recommendations of the group will be announced in February, 2004. In addition, a University-wide Retention and Graduation Rate Council has been established to examine persistence and attainment issues and will make specific recommendations to the President's Cabinet by the end of AY 2003-2004.

Through the University's successful actions taken under the Minority Achievement Plan, the University has attracted a growing number of African American and other minority students to the campus. This Plan provides for additional staff for minority recruitment; recruitment travel to targeted high schools; student visitations to campus; mailings; and telecounseling, 2+2, college-readiness, and community outreach programs. Presently, African Americans comprise 12.3% of total student enrollment, with minorities overall at 16.17%. During the current period, FSU has experienced a budget decline that has had an adverse affect on student services. However, the University is committed to creating an environment that enhances the retention and graduation rates of African-American and other minority students enrolled at the institution.

The pass rate for FSU's Social Work graduates completing the Basic Examination has been uneven for the last three testing years. During this period, only five FSU candidates out of 36 have failed the examination on the first attempt. The table below displays the number of students completing the examination and the pass rate for each year. These rates are significantly impacted by the small number of students that take the exam each year. For each student who does not pass the exam, the pass rate is affected by 11 to 17 percentage points.

FSU's Social Work program provides students with tools to help prepare them for the licensure exam. These include sponsoring student attendance at professional conferences, the addition of a new course which provides exam strengthening content for enhanced performance, and the use of the Area Concentration Achievement Test (ACAT) results for outcome assessment in order to strengthen program areas. The Social Work program encourages students in the last semester of their senior year to take a practice examination as preparation for sitting for the actual examination taken after graduation.

Test Result	1998 Testing Year	1999 Testing Year	2000 Testing Year	2001 Testing Year	2002 Testing Year
Pass	11	13	10	8	13
Fail	0	0	2	1	2
Total	11	13	12	9	15
Pass Rate	100%	100%	83%	89%	87%

Frostburg State University
Peer Performance Data, 2003

Institution	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African- American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities
Frostburg State U.	930-1090	16.4%	12.6%	73%	47.7%	31.0%
California U. of Penn.	850-1040	6.6%	5.4%	72%	39.5%	26.4%
East Stroudsburg U. of Penn.	870-1040	8.7%	4.0%	74%	49.3%	34.1%
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	970-1160	10.0%	5.2%	79%	50.6%	32.1%
Sonoma State U.	930-1140	18.2%	2.0%	77%	46.7%	35.5%
SUNY, C. at Oneonta	980-1130	8.3%	3.1%	68%	41.0%	N/A
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	940-1110	9.3%	3.7%	78%	55.9%	57.4%
SUNY, C. at Potsdam	940-1160	6.4%	2.3%	75%	52.9%	36.0%
Western Carolina U.	910-1100	8.9%	5.7%	70%	47.1%	51.1%
Western Connecticut State U.	850-1040	14.9%	6.0%	67%	41.0%	30.2%
Winthrop U.	940-1150	28.5%	25.9%	76%	55.4%	59.1%
Average of Peers	918-1107	12.0%	6.3%	73.6%	47.9%	40.2%

Institution	Six-year graduation rate African-Americans	Passing rate on teacher licensure exams	Passing rate in BSW social work licensing exam (1)	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate	FSU institution-specific indicators	
					FTES per full-time faculty	% of faculty with terminal degrees
Frostburg State U.	28.2%	91%	87%	14%	19	80%
California U. of Penn.	25.0%	84%	N/A	4%	21	56%
East Stroudsburg U. of Penn.	31.8%	91%	N/A	21%	22	73%
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	33.9%	66%	N/A	18%	22	54%
Sonoma State U.	27.3%	98%	N/A	1%	28	63%
SUNY, C. at Oneonta	N/A	96%	N/A	14%	25	74%
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	56.0%	95%	N/A	16%	22	66%
SUNY, C. at Potsdam	33.3%	98%	N/A	15%	18	69%
Western Carolina U.	61.5%	97%	N/A	16%	22	72%
Western Connecticut State U.	27.5%	100%	N/A	5%	24	83%
Winthrop U.	60.1%	93%	N/A	22%	19	54%
Average of Peers	39.6%	92%		13%	22	66%

N/A - Data not available

Notes:

(1) Passing rates for peers are not available from any of the following sources all of which were contacted:
 peers, state social work organizations, and the national social work organization. This applies to BSW graduates.

Salisbury University

Salisbury University exceeds the performance of its peers on many of its performance indicators. The university attracts highly qualified, new freshmen ranking first among its peers on the SAT exam. The percentage of minority and African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is above the peer average. In addition, Salisbury performs well compared to its peers in second-year retention and six-year graduation rates. The university has the highest second-year retention rate for all students and the highest six-year graduation rate for all students and African-American students. Salisbury ranks second in the six-year graduation rate for minority students.

Salisbury selected five institution-specific indicators: acceptance rate; percentage of full-time faculty who have earned a doctorate, first-professional or other terminal degree; student-faculty ratio; average high school grade point average of first-time freshmen; and state appropriations per full-time equivalent student. Compared to its peers, Salisbury is more selective. The university's acceptance rate is 52 percent compared to the peer average of 77 percent. Salisbury's focus on enrolling high quality students is also evidenced by the average high school grade point average of incoming freshmen. For the entering class, the average high school GPA is 3.47, which is above the peer average of 3.21. In addition, Salisbury's student-faculty ratio is below the average of its peers.

In terms of faculty quality, Salisbury performs below the average of its peers on the percentage of faculty with terminal degrees. Only 78 percent of Salisbury's faculty has earned a terminal degree compared to its peer average of 85 percent. However, efforts to attract more tenure-track faculty have resulted in an improvement in this area over the last year. In addition, Salisbury receives the second lowest state appropriation per full-time equivalent student; a level that is well below the peer average.

On professional licensure examinations, Salisbury has a fairly high proportion of students passing the Praxis II exam, although it is somewhat below the peer average and has decreased from the prior year. Many of Salisbury's peer institutions, however, use alternative certification tests. Performance on the nursing licensing exam has fallen over the last few years. Recent efforts by the institution to address this trend have not yet had an effect.

The Institution's Response

The university has taken a number of actions to improve its nursing licensure passing rates. The Department of Nursing began reviewing these declines more than two years before they were reflected in the Commission's peer analysis. Although Salisbury is enrolling a record number of nursing majors, the admissions criteria have been strengthened. The GPA required for admission has been elevated and students who have received unacceptable science grades before admission to the program are viewed negatively in the admissions process, even when repeating those courses to attain acceptable grades of C or higher. Additionally, in January of 2003, the department began requiring students to complete a software program by MEDS publishing. This program is

an NCLEX review program that a student completes throughout the semester, culminating with a video review at the end of the semester. The increased admissions standards and the NCLEX review software appear to have made a difference for the May 2003 class since several students who had all the risk factors for failing the NCLEX exam subsequently passed the exam on the first attempt. Furthermore, the data suggest a return to at least an 87.5% first-time licensure passing rate, although our May 2003 graduation rates appear to be 100%. Finally, as always there is on-going nursing faculty research into predictors of success on the NCLEX-RN exam for Salisbury University nursing students. The database for this research contains multiple years of information and is being used as a means of assessing the need for change in admission and/or progression standards. This database has been used to support the changes described previously.

The university also continues to monitor scores on the Praxis II professional exam. Given only two years of data on the Praxis II scores, SU's second year's rates higher than the first year's rates, the rigorous NCATE standards strictly adhered to by the University, and SU rates that are comparable to other Maryland institutions including Towson University and the University of Maryland College Park, it is premature to assume that these rates are low when there is no accounting for second-time test takers. Additionally, without data that permits the weighting of the averages of an institution's data, simple averages are unacceptable statistical indicators. Nonetheless, the University will track these data carefully over the next several years to determine if any intervention is needed.

Salisbury University
Peer Performance Data, 2003

Institution	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African- American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities ²	Six-year graduation rate African-Americans	Passing rate on teacher licensure exams
Salisbury U.	1050-1210	12.1%	8.0%	82%	68%	57%	61%	91%
Central Washington U.	880-1100	13.8%	1.8%	74%	51%	59%	50%	N/A
Eastern Illinois U.	20-23 ¹	10.5%	7.2%	81%	65%	44%	40%	98%
Humboldt State U.	930-1170	16.6%	2.7%	75%	38%	N/A	N/A	99%
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	970-1160	10.0%	5.2%	79%	51%	33%	34%	66%
North Carolina, U. of, Wilmington	1010-1170	8.0%	4.4%	80%	59%	55%	58%	98%
Northern Michigan U.	19-24 ¹	5.3%	1.7%	69%	48%	33%	11%	100%
Sonoma State U.	930-1140	18.2%	2.0%	77%	47%	37%	27%	98%
SUNY, C. at Oswego	960-1140	9.2%	3.8%	79%	50%	36%	34%	91%
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	940-1110	9.3%	3.7%	78%	56%	57%	56%	95%
Western Oregon U.	860-1090	11.1%	1.6%	70%	38%	N/A	N/A	100%
Average of Peers	935-1135	11.2%	3.4%	76.2%	50%	44.3%	38.8%	94%

Institution	Passing rate in nursing licensing exam	Alumni giving rate	SU institution-specific indicators				Total state appropriation/FTEs
			Acceptance rate	% of faculty w/terminal degrees	Ratio of FTEs to FTEF	Average HS GPA	
Salisbury U.	77%	16.5%	52%	78%	16.9	3.47	\$5,063
Central Washington U.	no program	N/A	89%	83%	20.2	3.20	\$5,570
Eastern Illinois U.	no program	9.9%	70%	74%	15.7	N/A	\$5,813
Humboldt State U.	84%	7.8%	74%	99%	17.1	3.21	\$10,713
Massachusetts, U. of, Dartmouth	92%	N/A	67%	87%	15.5	3.00	\$8,838
North Carolina, U. of, Wilmington	90%	11.0%	80%	87%	21.3	3.50	\$5,616
Northern Michigan U.	78%	12.5%	85%	86%	22.6	3.22	\$6,924
Sonoma State U.	85%	21.7%	92%	89%	19.2	3.20	\$8,616
SUNY, C. at Oswego	no program	16.1%	58%	80%	19.3	3.22	\$5,396
SUNY, C. at Plattsburgh	67%	25.1%	63%	81%	17.0	3.10	\$5,676
Western Oregon U.	no program	N/A	92%	86%	15.7	3.28	\$3,992
Average of Peers	83%	14.9%	77%	85%	18.4	3.21	\$6,715

N/A - Data not available

¹ The majority of EIU and NMU students submit ACT scores in lieu of the SAT. If ACT ranges were to be converted to SAT ranges using the College Board SAT-ACT comparison, the SAT ranges for Eastern Illinois University (EIU) and Northern Michigan University (NMU) would be 950-1070 and 910-1110, respectively. This would adjust the peer average to 934-1126.

² Comparative data for African-American and minority graduation rates are not available through national databases. The data provided were obtained through direct solicitation of peer institutions. After two requests, Humboldt State responded that they would be unable to answer our query due to lack of staff. Western Oregon never responded.

³ State does not have an assessment program for teacher certification or licensure.

⁴ Teacher education students are required to pass a licensure examination prior to graduation. Therefore, pass rates will always be 100%.

⁵ The testing period of the NCLEX-RN exam differs for NMU (4/1/2001 through 3/31/2002). This was the testing period provided by that institution.

Towson University

Towson University compares favorably to its peers on the vast majority of its performance indicators. The university ranks first among its peers for the SAT 25th percentile and second for the 75th percentile. The percentage of African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is above the peer average. In addition, Towson performs well compared to its peers in second-year retention and six-year graduation rate. The university has the third highest second year retention and graduation rates among its peers.

The university performs below the average of its peers on the percentage of minorities enrolled as undergraduate students. However, according to the MFR, this percentage has increased slightly over the last few years; from 14.4 percent in 1998 to 15 percent in 2002 and has remained constant for 2003. Furthermore, a closer analysis of Towson's peer institutions reveals that five of these institutions enroll a high proportion of Hispanic students, somewhat skewing the average. Towson's pass rate for the nursing exam fell to 79 percent. Most of the university's peers improved in this indicator. Therefore, Towson is now performing well below the peer average of those few peers with nursing programs. Additionally, Towson fails to meet the average of its peers in the pass rate for the Praxis exam. The institution reports a 92 percent pass rate, while the peer average is 95 percent.

Towson selected four institution-specific indicators: average high school grade point average of incoming freshmen; percent of undergraduates who live on campus; student-faculty ratio; and acceptance rate. Towson has become increasingly more selective in terms of freshmen quality. The average high school GPA for Towson freshmen is 3.4 compared to a 3.2 average for its peers. This represents an increase from the previous year. Further, Towson's acceptance rate has fallen to 59 percent, below the peer average. In addition, roughly a quarter of Towson's undergraduate students reside on campus and Towson's student-faculty ratio meets the average of its peers.

In some cases, Commission staff was unable to make a complete assessment of Towson's performance relative to its peers because of missing data. For example, data on the average high school grade point average for incoming students are not provided for three of Towson's peers. Also, four of Towson's peers failed to report data on six-year graduation rates for minorities and African-American students.

The Institution's Response

The university stresses that the rates of enrollment, retention, and graduation of minority students are high priorities. It has modified all phases of the recruitment and enrollment cycle to improve the size and academic profile of the minority applicant pools; to admit higher percentages of applicants; to improve yield; and to improve retention and graduation rates. Based on these modifications, the university is seeing results. The percent minority among new first-time freshmen increased from 12.1 percent in Fall 2002

to 14.5 percent in Fall 2003 and the percent minority among new transfer students increased from 14.8 percent in Fall 2002 to 18.9 percent in Fall 2003.

Towson University recognizes that the minority six-year rates are well below those of white students. The loss of minority students after three or more semesters is one of the barriers to improving diversity. The institutions current strategy is to place greater emphasis on high school grade point average rather than on test scores to increase the number of admitted students of color. Students with strong high school or transfer grade point averages, even those with lower SAT scores, have high probability of remaining enrolled through graduation. Even now, Towson University's minority student second-year retention rates are high and minority student six-year graduation rates are strong compared with those of its peer institutions. Using higher high school GPA or transfer requirements as the focus for admissions, we are seeing marked improvement in third-year and forth-year retention of minority students. Towson believes that this trend will continue and that more of these students will persist until graduation. This means that the university's success in recruiting higher numbers of new minority students who will remain through graduation will serve to increase the overall minority numbers rather than merely replacing students who leave after the third or fourth semester.

The university's research also shows that financial aid not only increases the matriculation rate but also increases retention and graduation rates of minority students. According to Towson, the university has significantly increased spending on institutional need-based financial aid and will continue to do so in the coming years. Towson is confident that this, too, will have a positive impact on access and retention.

The university has taken a number of actions within identified programs to address concerns about pass rates on Praxis II. In one program, the concern about pass rates was a statewide issue that was communicated to MSDE. Additional review by MSDE of Maryland's "cut score" determined that Maryland's cut score was the highest in the nation, and out of line with nearby states. The outcome was to change Maryland's cut score to a more reasonable yet challenging level, which should lead to increased performance by all Maryland students on this content-specific Praxis II. Additionally, the university's academic departments analyzed their program content in light of the content-specific sections of the Praxis II exam to ensure student preparation. Adjustments have been made to the curriculum. Towson believes that this should lead to increased pass rates for students.

Another significant note is a significant proportion of Praxis II test-takers whose scores are included in the Towson University percentage are "post-baccalaureate" students who attended Towson only to complete the state teacher certification requirements. Many of these students earned their bachelors degrees elsewhere. Additional efforts are being made to inform these students of the required content on the various Praxis II tests.

Improving the NCLEX-RN pass rate is another high priority for the university. Towson's nursing faculty recently implemented a curricular addition where students are now required to participate in a comprehensive "Total Testing Program." This program assists

in identifying students' areas of weakness at pre-specified intervals long before the student takes the exam. Subsequently this testing protocol provides an individualized "action plan" based on students' areas of weakness that must be completed as part of the progression in the nursing major. In addition, the University added a special institutionally funded scholarship program for entering freshmen and transfer nursing students to increase the chances that the strongest admitted students would enroll. Towson is confident that these changes will result in much improved pass rates over the next several years.

Towson University

Peer Performance Data, 2003

Institution	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African- American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African-Americans
Towson U.	1020-1160	14.9%	9.7%	82%	61.5%	47.4%	44.2%
California State U., Fresno	810-1090	38.4%	4.7%	80%	41.7%	N/A*	N/A*
California State U., Northridge	800-1060	48.7%	8.5%	74%	25.6%	N/A*	N/A*
Sacramento	850-1100	39.4%	5.9%	77%	40.0%	33.7%	22.9%
Eastern Illinois U.	960-1130	11.7%	7.7%	81%	65.3%	43.5%	39.8%
Montclair State C.	910-1120	31.8%	11.0%	83%	61.6%	54.3%	47.0%
North Carolina, U. of, Charlotte	950-1150	23.9%	16.2%	76%	50.8%	51.3%	52.2%
Southwest Texas State U.	950-1120	26.2%	5.1%	72%	41.3%	N/A*	N/A*
West Chester U. of PA	1010-1170	8.0%	4.4%	83%	59.0%	N/A*	N/A*
Western Illinois U.	reports ACT	11.1%	6.5%	74%	49.1%	40.6%	39.8%
Western Kentucky U.	reports ACT	10.5%	8.4%	73%	41.6%	38.2%	38.0%
Average of Peers	905-1118	25.0%	7.8%	77.3%	47.6%	43.6%	40.0%

Institution	Passing rate on teacher licensure exams	Passing rate in nursing licensing exam	Alumni giving rate	TU institution-specific indicators			
				Average High School GPA	% Residential Students	Student/Faculty Ratio	Selectivity (Acceptance Rate)
Towson U.	92%	79%	9.4%	3.40	25%	18/1	59%
California State U., Fresno	94%	89%	3.9%	3.20	6%	16/1	63%
California State U., Northridge	99%	RN to BSN only	2.9%	3.10	N/A	20/1	83%
Sacramento	96%	87%	6.9%	3.20	5%	21/1	51%
Eastern Illinois U.	98%	Pre-nursing program only	9.9%	N/A	43%	16/1	70%
Montclair State C.	96%	No nursing program	8.6%	N/A	21%	14/1	50%
North Carolina, U. of, Charlotte	98%	100%	9.7%	3.50	27%	16/1	73%
Southwest Texas State U.	92%	Pre-nursing program only	8.6%	N/A	21%	25/1	58%
West Chester U. of PA	83%	N/A	1.2%	3.20	36%	17/1	48%
Western Illinois U.	99%	Pre-nursing program only	18.0%	3.10	46%	16/1	61%
Western Kentucky U.	92%	96%	13.7%	3.10	37%	18/1	85%
Average of Peers	95%	93%	8.3%	3.20	26.9%	18/1	64%

N/A - Data not available

* Despite repeated e-mails & telephone calls, these institutions did not respond to our request for graduation rate data.

8/18/2003

University of Baltimore

Due to the University of Baltimore's (UB) mission to provide upper division bachelor's, master's, and professional degrees, the university does not have traditional performance measures such as SAT scores, acceptance rates, and average high school grade point averages for incoming freshmen. Instead, it focuses on graduate student achievement and faculty quality. Overall, the university exceeds the performance of its peers on every indicator. The percentage of African-American and minority undergraduate students attending the institution is above the peer average.

The university also compares favorably in its undergraduate alumni-giving rate. Compared to its peers, the institution exceeds the average of its peers on this indicator. It should be noted however, that only three of the peer institutions provide data for alumni giving and UB's rate fell from the previous year. In addition, the university is strong in the number of awards per full-time instructional faculty. It significantly exceeds the average of its peers in this indicator and has increased the awards per full-time faculty by 25 percent over last year.

The university selected two institution-specific indicators: expenditures for research and the proportion of part-time faculty. For both of these indicators, the university's performance exceeds its peer average. UB reports the third highest expenditures for research and ranks third in the percentage of part-time faculty.

The university reports a 73 percent passing rate on the law-licensing exam, a slight decrease from the prior year rate of 74 percent. Unfortunately, peer comparisons for this indicator are impossible, as the university has no peers that have a law school. However, it is worth comparing to Maryland's other public law school at the University of Maryland, Baltimore (UMB). The university's students trail those at UMB only slightly as UMB reports a pass rate of 76 percent this year.

The Institution's Response

According to the University, the University System of Maryland (USM) gathers data for this measure from the Council for Aid to Education's (CASE) report 2002 Voluntary Support of Education. As a response to the CASE survey is voluntary, participation on the part of UB's peers cannot be guaranteed. The university notes that at this time, neither USM nor the University of Baltimore has located any other national source of the data.

The university notes that since none of the UB's peers have law schools, it would be necessary to select new or additional peers that do have law schools. Currently there are no other institutions in the same Carnegie class as the University of Baltimore (Masters II) that have law schools. According to the university, it would be necessary to select new or additional peers from the Doctoral Research Intensive Carnegie class, an action that require the approval of both USM and MHEC.

University of Baltimore

Peer Performance Data, 2003

Institution	% minority of all undergraduates	% African-American of all undergraduates	Passing rate in LAW licensing exam	Alumni giving rate
Baltimore, U. of	38.2%	32.5%	73%	20.4%
California State U., Bakersfield	45.6%	6.8%	no law school	10.5%
California State U., San Marcos	31.4%	2.9%	no law school	3.2%
Governors State U.	37.2%	30.4%	no law school	NA
Houston, U. of, Clear Lake	29.6%	7.5%	no law school	NA
Illinois, U. of, Springfield	11.5%	8.1%	no law school	NA
Michigan, U. of, Dearborn	17.1%	7.7%	no law school	NA
New Jersey City U.	62.3%	20.5%	no law school	NA
Penn State U, Harrisburg, Capital C.	11.9%	4.9%	no law school	NA
Texas A&M U., Corpus Christi	41.1%	2.4%	no law school	3.0%
Wisconsin, U. of, Whitewater	7.8%	3.4%	no law school	NA
Average of Peers	29.6%	9.5%		5.6%

-41-

Institution	Awards per 100 F-T faculty (5 yrs.)	UB institution-specific indicators	
		Expenditures for research	% part-time faculty
Baltimore, U. of	4.72	\$ 4,465,575	51.5%
California State U., Bakersfield	1.95	6,251,063	39.6%
California State U., San Marcos	0.55	1,811,574	51.3%
Governors State U.	0.54	94,641	52.1%
Houston, U. of, Clear Lake	1.85	11,785,164	13.0%
Illinois, U. of, Springfield	2.03	982,191	33.2%
Michigan, U. of, Dearborn	2.25	2,346,571	45.2%
New Jersey City U.	0.43	1,941,627	54.5%
Penn State U, Harrisburg, Capital C.	NA	1,942,015	41.8%
Texas A&M U., Corpus Christi	0.95	3,480,291	19.7%
Wisconsin, U. of, Whitewater	1.00	407,338	19.5%
Average of Peers	1.3	\$ 3,104,248	37.0%

N/A - Data not available

Note: Bar exam passage rates vary considerably from state to state. Number reported for each school is for the state in which that school had the largest number of first-time takers.

8/4/2003

University of Maryland, Baltimore

The University of Maryland, Baltimore's (UMB) peer institutions reflect the university's status as the State's public academic health and law university with six professional schools. UMB's peers include institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as 'specialized' and institutions classified as 'Research I' institutions. Compared to its peer institutions, the university shows a wide range of performance. The university's unique structure permits only a few generalizations.

The percentage of minority and African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is above the peer average.

Using available data, it appears that UMB has increased the percentage of its students that pass licensing exams. Approximately 88 percent of nursing students passed their licensing exam, increasing from 86 percent in the previous year. However, this falls slightly short of the peer average of 89 percent. Medical students maintained their high pass rate of 96 percent. No peer institution reported on medical exams, although it should be noted that the current national pass rate is 95 percent. The institution reports that 76 percent of law students passed their exam, down from 81 percent in the previous year. Peer institutions report an 89 percent pass rate on this particular exam. Further, the university reports a pass rate of 100 percent on its dental exams. The pass rate for the social work exam is 86 percent. No peers report this data, however, the national average pass rate for the social work exam is 79 percent.

The university selected six institution-specific indicators: total medicine R&D expenditures; medicine research grants per basic research faculty; medicine research grants per clinical faculty; percent of minority students enrolled; total headcount enrollment; and percentage of graduate and professional students enrolled. These data show that UMB's school of medicine has the third highest level of research grants per basic research faculty and the second highest level of research grants per clinical faculty. Although the remaining institution-specific indicators are primarily descriptive indicators, they provide an indication of the type of student population attending the institution. Compared to its peers, UMB has the second lowest total headcount enrollment and ranks second in the percentage of graduate and professional student enrollment. In addition, the percent of minorities of total enrollment is above the peer average and represents an increase over last year.

Additional Comments

The university did not have specific comments regarding its unfavorable comparison to its peers in the law licensing exam pass rates and the lack of peer data in other indicators, such as dental exam pass rates and social work licensing exam pass rates. The university did note that it will plan to address the recommendation concerning the law bar exam pass rates and will investigate alternative performance indicators for other professional programs.

University of Maryland, Baltimore
Peer Performance Data, 2003

Institution	% minority of all undergraduates	% African- American of all undergraduates	Passing rate in licensure exams				Social Work	Alumni giving rate	Total R&D expenditures in medicine (000s)
			Nursing	Medical	Law	Dental			
Maryland, U. of Baltimore	39.5%	28.5%	88%	96%	76%	100%	86%	41.8%	\$ 191,206
Alabama, U. of Birmingham	34.6%	30.3%	90%	Footnote 4	no law school		Footnote 5	6.5%	149,791
California, U. of San Francisco	54.3%	2.9%	No BSN program	Footnote 4	no law school		No social work prog.	18.6%	456,729
Illinois, U. of Chicago	50.0%	9.5%	Footnote 3	Footnote 4	no law school		Footnote 5	NA	111,543
Michigan, U. of Ann Arbor	23.7%	8.0%	84%	Footnote 4	90%		Footnote 5	16.0%	186,148
North Carolina, U. of Chapel Hill	19.4%	11.1%	93%	Footnote 4	87%		Footnote 5	25.9%	116,484
Connecticut, U. of Texas, U. of Austin Virginia, U. of					90% 91% 88%				
Average of Peers	36.8%	12.4%	89%	N/A	89%			16.8%	\$ 210,139
			National average 87%		Natl. pass rate 95%				

Institution	Total R&D expenditures in medicine per FT med. faculty	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures in medicine	UMB institution-specific indicators				Total headcount enrollment	Grad. & 1st prof. as % of total headct.
			Total medicine R&D spending (millions)	Medicine research grants per Basic Res. faculty ¹	Medicine research grants per Clinical faculty ²	% minorities of total enrollment		
Maryland, U. of Baltimore	\$ 200,426	10.4%	\$ 140.8	\$ 145,519	\$ 146,560	32.9%	5,470	83.1%
Alabama, U. of Birmingham	150,242	10.7%	142.4	181,370	116,823	29.8%	15,579	32.6%
California, U. of San Francisco	334,982	2.5%	358.0	294,648	190,753	45.3%	3,527	99.0%
Illinois, U. of Chicago	116,677	24.3%	61.7	98,714	46,548	42.5%	26,138	36.7%
Michigan, U. of Ann Arbor	119,020	7.2%	159.7	112,471	91,543	23.5%	38,972	37.2%
North Carolina, U. of Chapel Hill	104,846	14.5%	122.1	98,916	55,382	18.1%	26,028	38.7%
Average of Peers	\$ 165,153	11.8%	\$ 168.8	\$ 157,424	\$ 100,210	31.8%	22,049	48.8%

N/A - Data not available

Note: Bar exam passage rates vary considerably from state to state. Number reported for each school is for the state in which that school had the largest number of first-time takers.

The following universities are added for comparison with bar passing rates only: Connecticut; Texas; Austin; and Virginia.

¹ UMB figures adjusted to eliminate DMRT faculty incorrectly included as Basic Science faculty.

² UMB figures adjusted to eliminate Research Faculty Assistants from the Clinical Faculty counts.

³ Has not responded to request as of August 14, 2003.

⁴ UCSF provided USMLE Step I but not Step II. Other schools have not yet provided requested information.

⁵ Peer institutions did not provide data as requested because Schools of Social Work must sign a release form stating that test scores received from the testing entity are for internal use only and are not to be used for comparison purposes.

University of Maryland Baltimore County

The University of Maryland Baltimore County (UMBC) exceeds the performance of its peers on the majority of its indicators. In terms of quality of new freshmen, the University ranks first among its peers for the SAT 25th percentile and is tied for second for the 75th percentile. The percentage of minority and African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is far above the peer average. Furthermore, the university's second-year retention rate and six-year graduation rates for minority and African-American students exceeds the peer average. Comparisons of faculty quality and research are favorable for the university. It ranks second in the total number of awards per full-time instructional faculty and, over the last five years, had the highest average annual percent growth in federally financed research and development expenditures.

The university however, performs below the average of its peers on several of performance measures. For the six-year graduation rate, UMBC is slightly below the average of its peers. Despite efforts by the university to improve this indicator, it has fallen slightly from the previous year. The university ranks last in the total amount of research and development expenditures received from federal, state, industry and other sources. In addition, UMBC ranks last in total research and development (R&D) expenditures per full-time faculty. In both instances, the university falls well below the average of its peers on these indicators. However, according to MFR data, the university has increased its R&D expenditures from \$18.2 in FY 1998 to \$36.3 million in the most recent year.

UMBC has the second lowest percentage of alumni giving among its peers. The university's 7.7 percent alumni giving rate is substantially lower than its peer average. This rate has fallen from last year's rate of 10.1 percent.

The university selected three institution-specific indicators: rank in the number of bachelor's degrees awarded in information technology, rank in the ratio of invention disclosures per \$100 million in total R&D expenditures, and student-to-faculty ratio. Among the university's institution-specific indicators, UMBC ranks first in the number of bachelor's degrees awarded in information technology and ranks first in the ratio of invention disclosures to research and development expenditures.

The university did not compare favorably in terms of teacher preparation, performing significantly below it peers. Moreover, the university has the third highest student-to-faculty ratio, representing a slight decline from last year's performance on this indicator.

The Institution's Response

The university has taken a number of actions to try to understand and improve the graduation rate. A telephone drop-out survey conducted late Spring 2001 revealed that the primary reason students (who had matriculated as first-time freshmen) leave UMBC within the first two years is because the major they wanted is not available. Compared to the average of UMBC's peers, the campus awards bachelor's degrees in fewer than half

the number of majors (34 compared to 75). For example, UMBC is the only campus among its peers that does not offer a business program, one of the most popular majors for undergraduates nationwide. UMBC has proposed, and will continue to propose, new undergraduate programs in selected mission-related areas to increase the breadth of majors offered.

As part of the university's planning process, the university formed a retention committee in Fall 2003 to review relevant data and task force reports regarding UMBC retention and graduation rate issues. This committee will identify short- and long-term strategies to improve retention and graduation rates, recognizing that it will take time to impact these rates. In the meantime, the campus is continuing previously implemented strategies to increase the percentage of freshmen living in residence halls, increase freshman participation in learning-living communities as well as first year academic seminars (designed to enhance student engagement beyond the classroom), and enhance advisement support services (reallocating funds to provide professional advisors for UMBC's largest departments and providing additional tutoring support for writing and mathematics in the Learning Resources Center).

For the alumni-giving rate, UMBC is a young institution and, until recently, campus efforts in, and resources for, fundraising have focused more on maximizing funds through corporate and foundation philanthropy rather than through alumni giving. These efforts have been successful in generating substantial restricted funding sources: UMBC's first capital campaign raised \$66 million, exceeding our \$50 million goal.

Of the ten UMBC peers, seven are Land Grant institutions and two are in a university system that is designated as Land Grant. As Land Grant colleges and universities, these institutions receive substantial federal funds to deliver education and research and technology development in areas including agriculture, home economics, forestry, and veterinary medicine. However, the university has made great improvements in total R&D expenditures and total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty. Compared to the ten peer institutions, UMBC's average annual growth rate in federal R&D expenditures over the last five years has been over six times the average (38.3% vs. 6.0%). The university's efforts to attract and support outstanding research faculty and to establish major research centers are getting results.

The university explained that its student-faculty ratio increased significantly because of increases in enrollment over the last six years. Furthermore, fiscal constraints have hampered the university's ability to recruit new faculty to keep pace with enrollment growth.

The university explained since comparing Praxis II passing rates across different states and institutions is problematic states use different cut-off scores to determine pass rates and institutions differ in terms of their requirements for completing teacher education programs. Despite these differences, the university is concerned about the success rate of its teacher candidates and has identified methods to improve future passage rates.

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Peer Performance Data, 2003

Institution	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African- American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate*	Six-year graduation rate all minorities*	Six-year graduation rate African-Americans*	Passing rate on teacher licensure exams
UMBC	1120-1290 reports ACT	37.2%	15.6%	83%	53%	56%	54%	89%**
Arkansas, U. of, Main	940-1190	12.5%	6.1%	79%	45%	30%	26%	100%
California, U. of, Riverside	1030-1270	69.6%	5.8%	85%	66%	66%	56%	99%
California, U. of, Santa Cruz	1110-1310	33.2%	2.3%	86%	67%	61%	47%	98%
Clemson U.	1080-1270	10.1%	7.4%	86%	72%	70%	75%	92%
Delaware, U. of	reports ACT	11.9%	5.9%	88%	72%	67%	64%	94%
Mississippi State U.	990-1180	20.9%	18.7%	79%	56%	45%	45%	100%
Oklahoma State U., Main	1020-1210	15.3%	3.4%	83%	55%	46%	38%	94%
Rhode Island, U. of	reports ACT	12.2%	4.3%	79%	58%	49%	44%	90%
SUNY, Albany	reports ACT	20.9%	8.3%	84%	62%	58%	64%	99%
Wyoming, U. of		6.6%	1.1%	76%	54%	33%	33%	***
Average of Peers	1028-1238	21.3%	6.3%	82.5%	61%	53%	49%	96%

Institution	Alumni giving rate	Total R&D expenditures (000s)	Total R&D expenditures per FT faculty	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	Awards per 100 F-T faculty (5 yrs.)	UMBC institution-specific indicators		
						Rank in IT bachelor's degrees awarded	Rank in ratio of invention disclosures to \$million R&D expenditures	Ratio of FTE students/ F-T faculty
UMBC	7.7%	\$ 29,641	\$ 76,790	38.3%	3.89	1st	1st	25.8
Arkansas, U. of, Main	17.7%	78,303	115,151	8.9%	1.76	2nd	5th	19.2
California, U. of, Riverside	6.1%	92,361	166,717	-1.3%	3.07	5th	N/A	24.2
California, U. of, Santa Cruz	47.5%	64,253	143,743	-1.6%	4.70	4th	N/A	28.4
Clemson U.	18.1%	123,885	148,188	15.7%	2.63	3rd	6th	18.6
Delaware, U. of	13.2%	77,491	76,572	8.4%	2.77	7th	3rd	18.8
Mississippi State U.	17.1%	146,939	170,068	18.0%	1.16	8th	8th	19.2
Oklahoma State U., Main	10.9%	90,311	104,406	0.5%	1.62	6th	4th	21.4
Rhode Island, U. of	15.7%	50,835	84,866	5.5%	1.50	11th	7th	18.6
SUNY, Albany	NA	70,119	123,667	-0.7%	3.00	9th	N/A	26.6
Wyoming, U. of	20.7%	\$ 40,978	\$ 80,349	6.7%	3.73	10th	2nd	18.6
Average of Peers	18.6%	\$ 83,548	\$ 121,373	6.0%	2.59			21.4

N/A - Data not available

* 1995 cohort information not available for U. of Arkansas. Used latest available data: 1993 cohort.

** Data presented for UMBC are based on attached ETS report. Also see attached memo to NCATE with explanation. The data reported for UMBC on the Title II Website are incorrect.

*** State does not have an assessment for teacher certification or licensure.

University of Maryland, College Park

The University of Maryland, College Park is measured only against its 'aspirational peers' - those institutions that College Park aspires to emulate in performance and reputation. Therefore, College Park is not yet performing at their level on many indicators. The university is below its peers in the proportion of minority undergraduate students. According to the MFR, College Park's goal is to increase the proportion of minority undergraduate students to 35 percent in 2004. However, this proportion has declined since 1998. It should be noted however, that the percentage of minorities enrolled at College Park is higher than the non-California institutions and the university has the highest percentage of African American undergraduate students enrolled.

Compared to its peers, the university has the lowest retention and graduation rates. The university's 14 percent alumni-giving rate is slightly below its peer average. In both instances, the university had made significant progress towards meeting its MFR goals. According to MFR data, UMCP is significantly improving the total number of annual alumni donors and is very close to meeting its 2004 goal. The institution has met and slightly surpassed its 2004 goal in terms of retention and graduation rates.

As an indication of the quality of the university's research efforts, College Park performs well compared to its peers in research and development (R&D) expenditures. In addition, the university ranks first in the annual percent growth of federal R&D expenditures. Although College Park's total R&D expenditures are below the peer average, this level is higher than R&D expenditures at Chapel Hill and UCLA and has grown over the prior year.

College Park has five institution-specific indicators: the number of graduate-level colleges, programs or specialty areas ranked among the top 25 in the nation; the number of graduate-level colleges, programs or specialty areas ranked among the top 15 in the nation; the percent change over five years in the number of faculty holding membership in one of three national academies; the number of invention disclosures reported per \$100 million in total research and development expenditures; and the number of degrees awarded to African-American students. Although College Park ranks last in the number of graduate-level programs ranked among the top 25 and second to last among the top 15 in the nation, the university has continued to improve each year.

As further evidence of its aspiration to reach its peers, College Park ranks first in the percentage increase in the number of Maryland faculty members holding membership in one of the national academies. In addition, College Park exceeds the peer average in the number of invention disclosures per \$100 million in total R&D expenditures. It should be noted however, that two peers fail to report data on this particular indicator.

In preparing teacher candidates, the university reports a pass rate of 89 percent. This represents a drop from 95 percent two years ago.

The Institution's Response

The University of Maryland, College Park (UMCP) notes that the institution is measured against a set of "aspirational" peers: institutions that are among the very best public universities in the country. Four of Maryland's five peers were recognized as among America's most elite research institutions by the AAU almost six decades before UM began to achieve the same level of recognition. Despite the decades-long head start of its peers, UMCP has begun to perform within the bounds of its peers on half of the peer performance measures. Of the eighteen measures, UMCP leads the peer group on 28% and outperforms the peer average on 39% of the indicators.

In terms of diversity, the university notes that its minority undergraduate population, as a percentage of all undergraduates, is higher than 3 peer institutions. The dramatically high proportions of minority students at UC-Berkeley and UCLA (55% and 56%, respectively) are more than double those at any other peer institution (except Maryland), which causes the average to be skewed. More importantly, however, one minority group heavily influences the percent of minority enrolled: Asian Americans. At UC-Berkeley, Asian-American students account for 41% of all undergraduate students, and at UCLA they account for 37%. At both schools, the percentage of Asian-American students is twice that of any other minority group and outnumbers all other racial groups, minority or otherwise. In comparison, UMCP has the most balanced representation of minorities, with African American students making up approximately 13% of all undergraduates; Asian American students making up another 14%; and Hispanic and American Indian students making up another 6%. Currently, UMCP graduates almost twice the number of African American students than the peer average. UMCP hopes to increase the number of minority students enrolled and will continue to employ strategies to recruit, retain, and graduate students of color.

To improve awards per full-time faculty, the university states that while the peer average has declined in recent years, UMCP's awards per full-time faculty has fluctuated. The measure is dependent on the quality of research conducted by the faculty. While research funding is tenuous during these tight budgetary times, the university will continue to encourage faculty with the potential to reach national eminence to seek out research opportunities, particularly in areas of national interest.

According to the university, the PRAXIS II exam is considered a more challenging exam with higher expectations of students and more rigorous content. As a result, the NTE exam is being phased out. This drop in the rate represents a change in the instrument of measure that is reported. As indicated in the MFR, the PRAXIS II pass rates are expected to increase and to reach 100% by 2004.

The university notes that its total research and development (R&D) expenditures has increased over the past couple of years. With new initiatives and growth aimed at biological sciences, total R&D is expected to continue increasing. As UMCP leads its peers in the 5-year annual percent growth in federal R&D expenditure, the university also

anticipates becoming a leader in total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty in the next few years.

UMCP's six-year graduation rate has risen seven percentage points in four years, to 70.4% for the 1997 cohort (the most recent year for which data are available). UMCP's first-year retention rate for all UMCP first-time, full-time freshmen has increased to 93% in 2003 – an increase of seven percentage points from 1993. The University does recognize that more needs to be done to close the performance gap with UMCP's peers. Part of the problem is the way in which change in these areas occurs. The measures themselves represent the culmination of long-term processes in which the impact of an intervention made at one point in the process will not be known for five or six years. The rates of increase for these two indicators far surpass the average rates of its peers. For example, in the past three reporting years, the six-year graduation rate has increased 5.2 percentage points, as compared with UMCP's peer average increase of 2.5 points. The university attributes the leap in the six-year graduate rate to early investments in increasing the quality of the institution. The university predicts that the rates will continue to increase, as its four- and five-year graduation rates have disproportionately increased this past year as well. The story is even more promising when minority student numbers are examined; UMCP's six-year graduation rate for all minorities rose 7.7 percentage points in the past three reporting years, as compared with the 2.9 point average increase with its peers, and that rate for African Americans rose 11.2 points at UMCP as compared with the 5.7 point average increase with its peers.

University of Maryland, College Park
Peer Performance Data, 2003

Institution	SAT 25th/75th %ile (3)	% minority of all undergraduates	% African- American undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate (4)	Six-year graduation rate all minorities (4)	Six-year graduation rate African-Americans (4)	Passing rate on teacher licensure exams	Average (2-yr.) undergraduate alumni giving rate
Maryland, U. of, College Park	1200-1350	31.7%	12.4%	91%	68.7%	57.2%	89%	17%
California, U. of, Berkeley	1170-1440	55.8%	3.7%	96%	83.0%	64.2%	100%	17%
California, U. of, Los Angeles	1160-1400	56.7%	3.7%	97%	83.8%	69.6%	100%	12%
Illinois, U. of, Urbana-Champaign	1140-1340	25.7%	6.9%	92%	71.7%	60.7%	100%	13%
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	1180-1340	25.7%	8.0%	95%	84.3%	65.9%	100%	14%
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	1150-1370	19.4%	11.1%	94%	80.2%	70.0%	98%	25%
Average of Peers	1168-1378	36.7%	6.7%	94.8%	82.2%	66.1%	100%	16%

Institution	Total R&D expenditures (000s)	Total R&D expenditures per FT faculty	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	Awards per 100 F-T faculty (5 yrs)	UMCP institution-specific indicators				Number of degrees awarded to African-American students
					# grad level colleges/programs/ specialty areas ranked in top 25	# grad level colleges/programs/ specialty areas ranked in top 15	% change over 5 yrs in faculty member- ships in national academies (1)	# of invention disclosures per \$100M in total R&D (2)	
Maryland, U. of, College Park	\$ 267,383	\$ 197,133	9.2%	4.1	62	49	36%	44	640
California, U. of, Berkeley	408,553	300,407	4.3%	7.3	123	111	14%	N/A	258
California, U. of, Los Angeles	231,665	136,595	2.6%	4.6	108	85	9%	N/A	267
Illinois, U. of, Urbana-Champaign	384,210	216,334	6.8%	5.5	85	63	-4%	35	393
Michigan, U. of, Ann Arbor	414,375	221,118	8.6%	5.7	122	107	11%	30	375
North Carolina, U. of, Chapel Hill	187,092	171,487	5.1%	3.6	76	48	5%	38	355
Average of Peers	\$ 315,179	\$ 209,188	5.5%	5.3	103	83	7%	34	330

Notes: Maryland data NOT included in calculation of peer means

(1) Average increase in membership of 3 academies (AAAS, NAE, and NAS), equally weighting the percent change for each of the academies

(2) R&D total EXCLUDES expenditures in medical science

(3) UMCP collected SAT data from U.S. News & World Report, converting the ACT scores for Illinois and Michigan

(4) All graduation and retention rates are collected from the AAU Data Exchange and are current as of 2002.

8/18/2003

University of Maryland Eastern Shore

In many cases, the University of Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES) compares favorably to its peers. Despite a lower than average 25th and 75th percentile on the SAT, the university's six-year graduation rate for all students and the six-year graduation rates for all minorities and for African-Americans exceed the peer average. In addition, UMES's second-year retention rate slightly exceeds the peer average. It should also be noted that due to the addition of peers that have large minority populations, UMES currently is close to the average of its peers in the percentage of minority and African-American undergraduates attending the institution.

In terms of faculty and research efforts, UMES ranks first among its peers in the average annual percent growth in federally financed research and development expenditures and is above average in total research and development expenditures per full-time faculty. In both instances, the university has improved over the prior year. Conversely, the university reports a significant decline in teacher preparation performance. The university's passing rate on the Praxis II exam fell from 84 percent last year to 45 percent this year.

The university added three institution-specific indicators: the graduation rate of entering freshmen with SAT score of 900 or below; the graduation rate of entering freshmen with family income of less than \$30,000; and the percent of all students passing all certification examinations. These indicators provide a measure of the university's effectiveness in graduating students from different socio-economic backgrounds. UMES exceeds the peer average in only the SAT indicator. Missing data for UMES and for peer institutions make it difficult to complete a full evaluation. Although UMES' decision to include these measures is commendable, lack of data makes it difficult to evaluate the university's performance.

The integration of new peers has allowed for better data collection. However, there are still holes in the data. For example, six institutions fail to report an alumni-giving rate. The university's rate trails that of those institutions that do report. The university's rate also represents a fairly substantial decrease from the prior year.

The Institution's Response

The university notes several reasons for incomplete data. These include: (1) unavailability of data from other sources such as the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS); (2) peers' inability to provide some data because they do not routinely track the type of data needed and the their unwillingness to commit additional resources to do so and (3) lack of proactive discussions with peers concerning data needs. In addition, an offer to return their favor by helping them with their own data/information needs or other forms of collaboration/consortium arrangement would have made the relationship one of mutual benefit. This is the approach the institution intends to use in the future.

The university states that it is in the process of revising the UMES specific performance measures. The likely areas for developing new measures include quality of faculty, enrollment yield, program performance in the IT field, and institutional fiscal strength, to name a few. In this process, UMES would like to make sure that the new measures will continue to be meaningful for measuring institutional effectiveness, effective use of inputs and the soundness of the processes used in accomplishing important outcomes. The university also wants to ensure that the measures are feasible and will not be burdensome to its peers and/or require the use of additional resources.

The university is concerned about its low passage rate on the teacher preparation examination. According to UMES, the Federal Government mandated that in five years, institutions of higher education should achieve an institutional pass rate of at least 80 percent for program completers in the teacher education programs. The State of Maryland subsequently upheld the federal requirement. Consequently, all the other public universities and colleges of Maryland except UMES have brought their programs into compliance by implementing the new teacher education major requirements and revising the methods of reporting performance data. Over the past 18 months the university has made appropriate changes to its requirements for education majors consistent with state policy. In addition, UMES has included qualitative improvements in the program by providing more support to students so that they become successful. The university realigned its curriculum with the standards of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), the Maryland Redesign of Teacher Education, and PRAXIS. In addition, the students are provided additional instructional support to prepare for PRAXIS exams as well as out of regular hours support by their instructors throughout their professional training. A full-time PRAXIS coordinator has been recruited to monitor the PRAXIS assessment process. Those students who cannot afford the PRAXIS test fees are provided scholarship support. Given this seamless web of support, the university believes that its passing rate for teacher education programs will improve during the current (2003-2004) year and in the future.

In addition, the university's low alumni-giving rate is of concern. A new Vice President for Institutional Advancement who has recently joined the management team and is taking appropriate steps for improvement. The Division of Institutional Advancement is currently reviewing bids to outsource the UMES Annual Fund campaign from companies that specialize in crafting messages that appeal to alumni, both via direct mail and telephone. UMES will initiate an Annual Fund campaign this spring, with direct mail and phone contact with its entire 7,000 alumni. Subsequent contacts will be made with alumni again in the fall and just prior to Christmas. UMES anticipates the spring campaign will raise the Annual Alumni Giving Rate to 8 percent for Fiscal Year 2004. UMES will then continue an Annual Fund campaign targeted at alumni on a year-in, year-out basis. Additionally, UMES is placing increased emphasis in the Alumni Office on communications, alumni activities and events, and volunteer networks.

University of Maryland Eastern Shore

Peer Performance Data, 2003

University	SAT 25th/75th %ile	% minority of all undergraduates	% African- American of all undergraduates	Average (4-yr.) second-year retention rate	Six-year graduation rate	Six-year graduation rate all minorities	Six-year graduation rate African-Americans	Passing rate on teacher licensure exams
Maryland, U. of, Eastern Shore	730-930	77.9%	74.7%	74%	47%	42%	48%	45%
Alabama A&M U.	NA	92.2%	91.6%	70%	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%
Albany State U.	820-980	95.2%	94.4%	82%	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%
Alcorn State U.	reports ACT	93.1%	92.7%	72%	43%	42%	42%	100%
California State U., Bakersfield	820-1060	45.6%	6.8%	72%	39%	36%	21%	94%
Fort Valley State U.	924-1275	94.9%	94.2%	73%	25%	25%	25%	100%
North Carolina A&T State U.	790-1010	93.0%	91.1%	76%	44%	45%	45%	92%
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	820-1010	47.5%	21.8%	69%	37%	33%	31%	99%
Prairie View A&M U.	660-900	95.3%	92.4%	68%	32%	N/A	N/A	80%
South Carolina State U.	730-920	97.9%	97.4%	79%	45%	45%	45%	78%
Virginia State U.	710-890	97.4%	96.1%	71%	37%	38%	38%	*
Average of Peers	784-1006	85.2%	77.9%	73.2%	38%	38%	35%	94%

University	Alumni giving rate	Total R&D expenditures (000s)	Total R&D expenditures per FT faculty	Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	UMES institution-specific indicators		
					Graduation rate of entering freshmen with SAT score of 900 or below (19 SAT)	Graduation rate of entering freshmen with family income of \$30,000 or below	% of students passing all certification examinations
Maryland, U. of, Eastern Shore	1.4%	\$5,626	\$5,157	36.8%	41%	N/A	40%
Alabama A&M U.	NA	\$8,982	72,435	-17.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Albany State U.	NA	\$1,972	13,694	-0.7%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alcorn State U.	NA	\$7,370	59,435	26.7%	25%	N/A	93%
California State U., Bakersfield	10.5%	\$3,703	18,063	27.8%	21%	N/A	N/A
Fort Valley State U.	NA	\$2,768	19,222	0.7%	27%	26%	85%
North Carolina A&T State U.	10.6%	\$15,629	56,219	-0.9%	43%	44%	99%
North Carolina, U. of, Pembroke	9.4%	\$0	-	0.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Prairie View A&M U.	4.7%	\$11,297	53,540	-6.8%	N/A	N/A	77%
South Carolina State U.	NA	\$2,915	15,262	0.8%	28%	N/A	N/A
Virginia State U.	NA	\$5,066	29,976	11.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Average of Peers	8.8%	\$5,970	\$	4.2%	29%	35%	89%

N/A - Data not available

* Scores not reported because there are fewer than 10 test takers.

8/18/2003

University of Maryland University College

There are very few peer indicators for the University of Maryland University College (UMUC) due to the unique nature of this institution. For example, the majority of students attending UMUC attend part-time which reflects the university's target population: working adults. In addition, the university's indicators reflect other unique characteristics such as the university's goal to serve students through distance education. Therefore, the university does not have traditional performance measures such as SAT scores, acceptance rate and average high school grade point average for incoming freshmen.

Overall, the university compares favorably to its peers. The percentage of African-American undergraduate students attending the institution is far above the peer average. The university slightly exceeds its peers in the proportion of minority undergraduate students.

The university selected five institution-specific indicators: the percentage of African-American graduates in information technology; the percentage of undergraduate students over the age of 25; the number of post-baccalaureate degrees awarded in technology and business; the number of worldwide online courses; and the number of worldwide online enrollments. The university significantly exceeds the performance of its peers on all of these indicators. Unique among these institution-specific indicators is the number of worldwide online courses and enrollments. According to the MFR, enrollments in these areas has increased significantly; over 1,000 percent in five years.

The university has improved its data collection. For example, as it pertains to alumni giving, peer data are not provided for two of the peer institutions, compared to five missing institutions the previous year.

The Institution's Response

To improve alumni-giving, the university notes that as a general framework, its alumni are not typical of traditional institutions. Very few have completed their entire undergraduate degree at UMUC, rather they have transferred from other institutions. They are very non-traditional: working, with families, etc. Their view of their college education is closer to buying a commodity than to the "alma mater" experience of traditional students. Still, UMUC is committed to increasing the level of alumni giving. The following steps are but a sample of actions being taken to this effect:

- Tightening the segmentation of our alumni lists. The university is currently in the middle of the second year using the new segmented lists. At the end of this campaign (July), UMUC will have more data on its alumni donors.
- Initiating a process whereby UMUC is tracking the upper-level donors in order to move them into major gifts. In cases where the donor lives in the area, UMUC is making personal solicitations.
- Changing our direct mail appeal from a brochure to a letter from the president.

- Working more closely with the Alumni Association Board. For example, the Associate Director of Annual Programs serves as a liaison with the Alumni Association's Philanthropy Committee.
- Investigating other vehicles for donating, for example, the brick campaign. ("Buying" a brick with donor's name for the courtyard between the current hotel and the new addition).

To improve its data collection efforts for peer institutions, the university notes that as it continues to request data from its peers, relationships are established that are conducive to information sharing. UMUC is considering a letter from UMUC's president to the president of each peer institution (to be sent prior to data request) stressing the importance of obtaining the required information.

University of Maryland University College

Peer Performance Data, 2003

Institution	% minority of all undergraduates	% African-American of all undergraduates	Alumni giving rate
Maryland, U. of, University College	43.5%	31.7%	4.6%
California State U., Dominguez Hills	71.9%	29.0%	0.9%
CUNY Bernard Baruch C.	60.6%	16.7%	6.4%
CUNY Herbert H. Lehman C.	86.1%	37.4%	1.3%
CUNY Hunter C.	53.6%	17.9%	10.7%
CUNY Queens C.	44.7%	9.8%	19.7%
Eastern Michigan U. **	21.9%	17.0%	8.2%
Governors State U. ***	37.2%	30.4%	NA
North Carolina, U. of, Charlotte	23.9%	16.2%	9.7%
Southern Connecticut State U.	20.9%	12.2%	NA
Western Illinois U.	11.1%	6.5%	18.0%
Average of Peers	43.2%	19.3%	9.4%

Institution	UMUC institution-specific indicators			
	# of African-American IT graduates*	% of undergraduates 25 and older**	# of post-baccalaureate degrees in technology & mgmt.	Number of worldwide online enrollments (registrations)
Maryland, U. of, University College	184	83.5%	1017	110,423
California State U., Dominguez Hills	5	53.0%	114	2,933
CUNY Bernard Baruch C.	103	31.3%	604	0
CUNY Herbert H. Lehman C.	51	51.1%	24	320
CUNY Hunter C.	10	33.5%	N/A	N/A
CUNY Queens C.	3	34.7%	75	0
Eastern Michigan U. **	3	24.4%	293	4,697
Governors State U. ***	11	72.3%	69	N/A ***
North Carolina, U. of, Charlotte	15	24.0%	175	N/A
Southern Connecticut State U.	1	20.6%	57	N/A
Western Illinois U.	1	15.4%	79	1,208
Average of Peers	20	36.1%	166	1,526

N/A - Data not available

* Bachelor's degrees

** Difficulties incurred during implementation of new Banner DB beginning Spring 2003 required estimation of Spring 2003 data as part of FY03.

*** Data concerning online courses is not available as University administrators have been unable to agree upon a definition of what constitutes an "Online" course.

Morgan State University

Morgan State University exceeds the performance of its peers on many of its indicators. The university's second-year retention rates for minority students as well as the six-year graduation rates for minority and African-American students are above the peer average. Moreover, the university's Praxis pass rate is above the peer average. The rate is much improved over the previous year, marking an improvement in teacher preparation. It should be noted, however, that many of Morgan's peers do not use this exam. Furthermore, Morgan reports an increase of 17 percent in research grant and contract activity over the last year. Its peers report a comparable average increase of 18 percent for this indicator.

Conversely, the university performs below the average of its peers on a number of performance measures. Morgan has a relatively low second-year retention rate for all students and for African-American students compared to the peer average. This is due, in part, to improvement in peer performance and no improvement at Morgan. Morgan has comprehensive campus-wide policies aimed at strengthening retention and graduation rates. The results, however, are mixed. Retention rates have stayed the same, however, graduation rates for all minority students have improved.

Morgan compares favorably in terms of doctoral production. Due to its efforts to expand its doctoral programs, Morgan reports an increase of 118 percent in doctorates awarded from the prior year. This figure is higher than the peer average and represents a large increase from the previous year. However, because the number of doctoral degrees awarded by Morgan is low, percentage changes are exaggerated. Morgan should consider a more accurate measure of doctoral production, such as the actual number of degrees awarded yearly.

Morgan has several indicators that are subject to survey results, including student satisfaction with advanced studies and employment preparation. It is evident that surveys are not performed on a regular basis. As such, data is not available for annual review. The university should consider choosing new indicators of institution specific performance that would allow for readily available data and for a complete evaluation. Furthermore, the university reports no data for itself for graduate/professional school going rates.

In many other cases, it is difficult to compare the performance of Morgan relative to its peers due to the large number of missing data from its peers. For example, data for the alumni-giving category are not available for seven of its peers. Among those indicators where Morgan has the highest performance (i.e., second-year retention rates for all minorities) data are missing from at least six institutions.

The Institution's Response

In terms of the second-year retention rates and six-year graduation rates, the university notes that financial aid has become an even greater problem for Morgan students during

the past few years than it had been. For each of the past three years the University has denied enrollment to nearly 500 registered students due their inability to complete satisfactory financial arrangements. The fact that the affordability problem at other campuses is now being recognized as a serious one serves to highlight the even more serious difficulties faced by students from lower income families.

According to the university, year-to-year fluctuations in alumni-giving mask the success that the University has had in raising money. It has now raised 98% of its ambitious \$25 million capital campaign goal in just two years. Compared to fundraising programs at other HBCUs, Morgan's campaign is a relatively large one and a successful one. The University has been so encouraged that it is likely to launch another capital campaign following the conclusion of the current one.

With regards to receiving data from peer institutions, Morgan states that many campuses simply do not compile data comparable to that available from its campus. While non-performance descriptive data would be more readily available from other campuses than performance types of data, it would have far less potential for assessing performance. While the university plans to review the indicators currently in use, Morgan also will continue to encourage the campuses to collect additional data that can be used for comparisons.

Morgan State University Peer Performance Data

Institution	Fall 2001 Entering Freshman Class				Six Year Graduation Rate				% Inc. Doctorates From 1999
	Second Year Retention Rate		Minority		All	Black	Minority		
	All	Black	Black	Minority					
Morgan State University	74%	74%		75%	39%	35%	40%	118%	
University of Alabama - Huntsville	72%	77%		76%	38%	28%	33%	17%	
Florida A & M University	87%	87%		72%	44%	30%	44%	13%	
University of Massachusetts - Dartmouth	78%	87%		83%	46%	29%	36%	100%	
University of Massachusetts - Lowell	N/A	N/A		N/A	40%	27%	34%	-14%	
Michigan Technological University	78%	65%		65.0%	64%	45%	55%	18%	
Oakland University	72%	67.0%		67.0%	40%	21%	30%	18%	
Jackson State University	78%	N/A		N/A	31%	31%	31%	107%	
The College of New Jersey	95%	Not Collected		Not Collected	79%	51%	65%	Not Collected	
City University of New York City College	73%	Not Collected		Not Collected	24%	19%	23%	Not Collected	
North Carolina A&T University	76%	Not Collected		Not Collected	43%	44%	44%	40%	
Tennessee State University	71%	Not Collected		Not Collected	41%	42%	42%	62%	
Texas A&M University - Kingsville	59%	70%		70%	23%	14%	23%	7%	
Average of Peers	77%	76%		72%	43%	32%	38%	37%	
Institution	Spring 2001 Graduates				2000-01 PRAXIS Pass Rate	Spring 2000 Employer Sat.	Pct. Alumni Giving	%Growth Research Grants/Contracts ¹	
Grad/Prof School Going	Rate	Advanced Studies Prep.	Job Prep.						
Morgan State University	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected	98%	N/A	13%	17%	
University of Alabama - Huntsville	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected	Test not used	Not Collected	Not Available	10%	
Florida A & M University	16%	85%	81%	81%	N/A	Not Collected	Not Available	-14%	
University of Massachusetts - Dartmouth	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected	Test not used	Not Collected	Not Available	19%	
University of Massachusetts - Lowell	30%	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected	100%	Not Collected	16%	5%	
Michigan Technological University	14%	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected	100%	Not Collected	18%	Not Available	
Oakland University	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected	Test not used	Not Collected	5%	13%	
Jackson State University	N/A	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Available	Not Collected	Not Available	24%	
The College of New Jersey	14%	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Available	Not Collected	Not Available	Not Available	
City University of New York City College	35%	Not Available	Not Collected	Not Collected	Test not used	Not Collected	Not Available	Not Available	
North Carolina A&T University	29%	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	98%	95%	15%	20%	
Tennessee State University	Not Collected	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	95%	Not Collected	Not Available	71%	
Texas A&M University - Kingsville		Not Collected	Not Collected	Not Collected	58%	N/A	16%	18%	
Average of Peers	23%	85%	81%	81%	90%	95%	14%	18%	

St. Mary's College of Maryland

As previously described, St. Mary's College of Maryland (St. Mary's) has two sets of peers: one set that reflects the college's current mission and one set that reflects the aspirations of the college. The college exceeds its current peers in a number of indicators. It surpasses the average of its current peers in second-year retention rate, six-year graduation rate for all students, and the six-year graduation rate for African-Americans. St. Mary's has a higher percentage of full-time professors. Further, St. Mary's students have higher SAT scores than the students of most of its peers. It also has a higher percentage of minorities in its student population. Additionally, St. Mary's increased its percent of faculty with terminal degrees, surpassing the average of its current peers.

St. Mary's accepts a greater percentage of its applicants than the average of its peers, however, its yield rate is also greater. It should also be noted that St. Mary's tuition is markedly lower than the average of its peers, reflecting its public school status. Of the twelve current peers, four are public institutions. In a comparison of St. Mary's data to that of the public institutions only, St. Mary's ranks first in the vast majority of indicators, notably: faculty salaries, percentage of full-time faculty, second year retention and graduation rates for African-American students.

Not surprisingly, St. Mary's does not yet reach the average of its aspirant peers on most of its qualitative indicators. In a few instances, however, St. Mary's does exceed its aspirant peers. St. Mary's has a greater percentage of minorities of all but one of its aspirant peers. It also has the lowest tuition. Compared to its peers, the college also has the highest proportion of full-time freshmen receiving federal financial aid, which suggests that St. Mary's serves a large percentage of students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds.

St. Mary's fails to meet the averages of both its current and aspirant peers in a few categories. The institution lags significantly behind its peers in the rate of alumni giving, ranking the third lowest among all 18 peers. Similarly, only four other institutions have lower E&G expenditures per full-time student. And lastly, only four peers have a higher ratio of full-time students to full-time faculty.

It should be noted that St. Mary's data and the data of its peers were complete.

The Institution's Response

According to the college, Library holdings are a function of St. Mary's age, facility size, and budget. The college has been a four-year baccalaureate college for less than 40 years and its peers have been in business for over 100 in some cases and have much larger endowments. They have a longer history of collecting, and in most cases, a larger base budget. The college is fairly close to its peers when it comes to subscriptions to periodicals and is not likely to approach the size of its peers' libraries and grow to the 250,000 or 300,000 size – due to space limitations. The college notes that direct

borrowing through USMAI remedies some of the shortages.

With regards to alumni fundraising, St. Mary's reported a 26% annual alumni giving rate in the July 2002 MFR report. The college notes that St. Mary's has only been a four-year institution since 1967, so its four-year graduates are just now in their late 50s and at a time when substantial giving may be possible. The majority of St. Mary's peer institutions have a much older and larger alumni base. Regardless of that, the College continues to actively increase alumni giving rates with a number of initiatives.

Indicator	Current				Current Peers										
	Peer Average	Aspirant Peer Average	All Peers Average	Saint Mary's College	Beloit College	College of Wooster	Colorado University	Convenient College	Dickinson College	Gettysburg University	Guilford College	Mary Washington College	Southwestern University	University of Minnesota Morris	University of North Carolina Asheville
Quality/Selectivity															
Amount in total R & D pending, FY02	\$ 594,374	\$ 793,641	\$ 660,796	\$ 470,491	\$ 242,69	\$ 304,452	\$ 256,235	\$ 1,443,707	\$ 3,043,228	\$ 423,867	\$ 8,083	\$ 188,994	\$ 657,252	\$ 86,320	\$ 546,712
Percent of faculty with terminal degree	90%	96%	92%	93%	98%	98%	96%	90%	90%	92%	70%	78%	96%	90%	85%
Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank:															
Professor	\$ 73,367	\$ 85,783	\$ 77,506	\$ 75,800	\$ 67,700	\$ 69,300	\$ 86,800	\$ 80,800	\$ 75,000	\$ 81,200	\$ 55,000	\$ 75,300	\$ 81,200	\$ 68,900	\$ 68,000
Associate Professor	\$ 55,767	\$ 61,750	\$ 57,761	\$ 57,400	\$ 51,000	\$ 54,300	\$ 63,700	\$ 60,700	\$ 58,000	\$ 60,800	\$ 46,100	\$ 56,700	\$ 60,700	\$ 53,900	\$ 50,700
Assistant Professor	\$ 44,067	\$ 49,750	\$ 45,961	\$ 43,400	\$ 42,300	\$ 43,900	\$ 47,700	\$ 47,400	\$ 44,700	\$ 48,900	\$ 38,000	\$ 42,200	\$ 46,700	\$ 39,700	\$ 42,000
Percentile of full-time instructional faculty salary by rank:															
Professor	83.5%	94.0%	87.7%	85.8%	77.8%	80.5%	93.5%	89.9%	85.3%	90.2%	38.9%	85.4%	90.2%	80.2%	78.5%
Associate Professor	79.9%	91.5%	87.5%	84.6%	64.8%	71.5%	92.3%	90.3%	85.7%	89.4%	37.1%	82.3%	89.8%	76.5%	63.1%
Assistant Professor	71.2%	89.9%	84.0%	68.5%	60.0%	71.7%	86.3%	85.5%	76.0%	89.7%	33.3%	59.3%	83.5%	41.0%	63.9%
Average SAT scores of entering freshmen	1211	1310	1244	1225	1230	1180	1244	1309	1235	1230	1135	1205	1225	1220	1155
25th - 75th percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen	1115-1307	1223-1398	1151-1307	1120-1340	1070-1290	1070-1290	1190-1370	1232-1385	1150-1310	1150-1310	1020-1250	1120-1290	1130-1320	1110-1300	1050-1260
Acceptance Rate	64%	45%	57%	71%	66%	72%	69%	34%	64%	53%	79%	35%	59%	84%	59%
Yield Ratio	33%	34%	37%	44%	31%	31%	20%	32%	25%	29%	31%	36%	35%	45%	38%
Retention and Graduation															
Second year retention rate	86%	94%	86%	85%	90%	86%	92%	97%	89%	87%	76%	83%	88%	81%	78%
Average Six year graduation rate	72%	86%	76%	77%	69%	72%	80%	82%	80%	76%	72%	69%	80%	68%	73%
Six-year graduation rate for African-Americans	59%	82%	64%	80%	69%	55%	86%	67%	56%	Not Avail.	43%	50%	Not Avail.	44%	Not Avail.
Access, Fall 2000															
Total headcount enrollment	2,103	1,720	1,992	1,688	1,273	1,823	1,952	1,879	2,208	2,277	1,490	4,481	1,320	1,927	3,393
Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment	12%	11%	11%	14%	13%	8%	15%	10%	6%	5%	17%	1%	18%	16%	6%
Percent full-time undergraduates of total undergraduates	93%	99%	93%	89%	93%	98%	99%	96%	98%	99%	88%	82%	98%	93%	76%
Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment	99%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	99%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%
Annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduate	\$ 16,076	\$ 26,107	\$ 19,207	\$ 7,549	\$ 22,404	\$ 22,430	\$ 24,933	\$ 33,3859	\$ 25,485	\$ 23,748	\$ 17,645	\$ 1,814	\$ 16,690	\$ 6,142	\$ 2,216
Percent of FTI Freshmen receiving aid from federal grants, FY02	18%	9%	18%	42%	11%	17%	17%	6%	11%	20%	21%	11%	14%	48%	20%
Efficiency/Resources															
E&G expenditures per FTES	22,585	31,746	25,639	18,693	20,680	27,982	23,325	50,161	23,311	27,385	15,852	8,847	28,080	12,518	12,795
Average alumni giving rate	45.3%	61.8%	50.8%	31.6%	57.9%	48.9%	56.3%	67.9%	61.7%	41.7%	40.4%	30%	31%	16%	11%
Tuition and fees revenues as percent of E&G expenditures	12.3 to 1	10.2 to 1	11.6 to 1	12 to 1	11 to 1	12 to 1	9 to 1	11 to 1	12 to 1	13 to 1	15 to 1	16 to 1	11 to 1	13 to 1	13 to 1
Ratio of FTES to full-time faculty															
Academic library holdings	324,003	560,967	409,659	153,827	183,716	581,518	535,657	496,817	303,272	351,848	157,054	355,478	312,982	191,469	254,179
Serial subscriptions:	2,912	4,503	3,474	1,797	946	Not Avail.	1,313	2,279	6,163	4,778	829	2,419	1,469	9,042	2,014
Audiovisual materials:	22,540	45,749	30,276	16,109	7,283	12,416	21,419	155,884	12,247	10,151	1,079	1,136	1,469	2,140	9,916
Academic library expenditures per FTES	176.1	323.3	225.2	89.3	142.5	305.7	205.5	443.8	124.2	159.3	106.2	90.1	240.3	99.6	89.8

St. Mary's College of Maryland

Profile and Performance Indicators, 2002: Aspirant Peers

Indicator	Aspirant Peers						
	Virginia Military Institute	Bates College	Carleton College	Davidson College	Franklin and Marshall College	Hamilton College	Kenyon College
Quality/Selectivity							
Amount in total R & D spending, FY02	\$ 149,866	\$ 653,000	\$ 729,113	\$ 579,580	\$ 1,207,000	\$ 1,276,000	\$ 317,151
Percent of faculty with terminal degrees	94%	91%	95%	97%	97%	96%	97%
Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank:							
Professor	\$ 70,600	\$ 87,400	\$ 91,100	\$ 83,600	\$ 87,800	\$ 89,600	\$ 75,200
Associate Professor	53,700	63,300	64,300	59,900	61,100	66,600	55,300
Assistant Professor	43,700	48,100	54,900	48,700	49,500	50,300	47,000
Percentile of full-time instructional faculty salary by rank:							
Professor	81.6%	93.9%	>95%	91.6%	94.1%	>95%	85.3%
Associate Professor	75.9%	92.4%	93.3%	89.2%	90.6%	>95%	80.7%
Assistant Professor	70.6%	87.4%	>95%	89.1%	90.6%	91.6%	84.4%
Average SAT scores of entering freshman	1130	1335	1370	1323	1270	1285	1280
25th - 75th percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen	1040-1220	1270-1400	1280-1460	1235-1410	1170-1370	1200-1370	1180-1380
Acceptance Rate	63%	33%	37%	35%	55%	35%	66%
Yield Ratio	48%	42%	34%	40%	25%	29%	32%
Retention and Graduation							
Second year retention rate	84%	94%	95%	96%	92%	93%	92%
Average Six year graduation rate	70%	87%	89%	90%	80%	85%	84%
Six-year graduation rate for African-Americans	59%	86%	Not Avail.	Not Avail.	67%	92%	Not Avail.
Access, Fall 2000							
Total headcount enrollment	1,311	1,767	1,948	1,673	1,887	1,755	1,587
Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment	13%	8%	17%	12%	9%	13%	9%
Percent full-time undergraduates of total undergraduates	100%	100%	99%	100%	98%	99%	98%
Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduate	\$ 11,096	\$ 34,100	\$ 25,530	\$ 23,995	\$ 26,110	\$ 27,350	\$ 27,550
Percent of FT Freshmen receiving aid from federal grants, FY02	13%	6%	16%	8%	7%	11%	9%
Efficiency/Resources							
E&G expenditures per FTES	20,086	30,122	39,245	32,482	27,615	33,471	27,540
Average alumni giving rate	34%	49%	64%	53%	36%	54%	42%
Tuition and fees revenues as percent of E&G expenditures	28.2%	80.1%	48.1%	47.9%	69.1%	59.5%	66.2%
Ratio of FTES to full-time faculty	11 to 1	10 to 1	10 to 1	11 to 1	11 to 1	9 to 1	10 to 1
Academic library holdings							
Titles:	162,053	568,750	662,871	422,035	435,771	538,377	858,000
Serial subscriptions:	785	2,311	10,964	2,767	2,090	3,585	5,300
Audiovisual materials:	4,896	29,196	778	9,497	11,649	52,051	171,320
Academic library expenditures per FTES	106.2	298.7	355.9	240.4	222.8	313.1	508.6

Appendices

Appendix A. Methodology For Selecting Performance Peers At The University System Of Maryland Institutions

The process of selecting peers involved narrowing a long list of colleges and universities (approximately 3,600) to a medium-sized list (fewer than 250), then to a small group with key characteristics like those of the 'home' institution (between 22 and 60). The institutions in the smaller group are termed funding peers. Ultimately, USM institutions were asked to choose 10 performance peers from their lists.

The narrowing process proceeded as follows:

1. Only public universities were considered.
2. Institutions were categorized by Carnegie classification.
3. Six sets of variables were mathematically analyzed for each institution. Examples of these variables include:
 - Size
 - Student mix
 - Non-state revenues
 - Program mix
 - Location (urban vs. rural)

The analysis aimed to provide a comparatively short list of institutions, which are most like each USM institution. From the narrowed list, each USM institution then selected 10 performance peers based on criteria relevant to their specific institutional objectives.

Below is a list of top criteria used by each institution to select their performance peers.

Bowie

- SATs and/or ACT profiles
- Academic mission
- Types of programs
- General academic reputation
- Comparable student communities served

Coppin

- Program mix, especially teacher preparation
- Size
- Geographic location

Frostburg

- Similar unrestricted budgets
- Size
- Program mix
- Geographic location

Salisbury

- Size
- Program mix
- Mission

Towson

- Size
- Student mix
- Geographic location

University of Baltimore

- Program mix
- Size
- Urban setting

University of Maryland Baltimore County

- Size
- Mission, emphasis on science and technology
- Minority mix
- Exclusion of institutions with medical schools

University of Maryland Eastern Shore

- Similar unrestricted budgets
- Program mix
- Minority mix

University of Maryland University College

- Percentage of students over the age of 25
- Institution ranking
- Type of delivery formats used – especially on-line distance education programs

APPENDIX B. UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS FOR PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
1	SAT score 25 th /75 th %tile	NCES, IPEDS Institutional Characteristics, Fall 2002; U.S. News and World Report (for UMCP)	For all incoming freshmen, composite SAT score. For peer institutions which report ACT scores, ACT scores are reported but not converted to SAT. If institutions report both scores, the test which the greater number of students took is reported. For UMCP peers reporting ACT scores, ACT scores were converted to SAT.	Fall 2002
2	% minorities of all undergraduates	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey IPEDS Peer Analysis Website	Minorities include African-American, Asian, Hispanic, & Native American, but do not include Nonresident Alien or Unknown Race.	Fall 2002
3	% African-American of all undergraduates	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey IPEDS Peer Analysis Website	Self-explanatory	Fall 2002
4	Average second-year retention rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2003 edition; CSRDE (for UMCP)	The percentage of first-year freshmen who returned to the same college or university the following fall, averaged over the first-year classes entering between 1997 and 2000 (1998 and 2001 for UMCP).	1997-2000 data 1998-2001 data for UMCP
5	Six-year graduation rate	College Board, Annual Survey of Colleges, 2002-2003; or IPEDS GRS – obtained from peers; or Peer Analysis System; CSRDE (for UMCP)	Six-year graduation rate, 1995 cohort (1996 cohort for UMBC)	2001 (1995 cohort) 2002 (1996 cohort) – for UMBC and UMCP
6	Six-year graduation rate: all minorities	IPEDS, Graduation Rate Survey, obtained from peers; CSRDE (for UMCP)	Minorities include African-American, Asian, Hispanic, & Native American, but do not include Nonresident Alien or Unknown Race.	2001 (1995 cohort) 2002 (1996 cohort) – for UMBC & UMCP
7	Six-year graduation rate: African-Americans	IPEDS, Graduation Rate Survey, obtained from peers; CSRDE (for UMCP)	Self-explanatory.	2001 (1995 cohort) or 2002 (1996 cohort)
8	Passing rate on teacher licensing exam	Title II website, State	Summary pass rates are reported. These are defined	2001 test-takers cohort

Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
	Report 2002 for individual states (http://www.title2.org)	as the proportion of program completers who passed all tests they took for their areas of specialization among those who took one or more tests in their specialization areas (basic skills; professional knowledge & pedagogy; academic content areas; teaching special populations; other content areas; performance assessment). An individual is counted as a pass in the summary rate if they pass all required tests for any area in which they were prepared.	
9	Passing rate in nursing licensing exam	Peer institutions	2002 graduates
10	Passing rates in other licensure exams		
10a	Law – Bar examination	ABA-LSAC Official Guide to ABA-Approved Law Schools, 2004 edition	2001 graduates
10b	Pharmacy – Licensure examination	Peer institutions	2002 graduates
10c	Social Work – Licensure examination	Peer institutions	2001
10d	Dentistry – Examination	Peer institutions	2002 graduates
10e	Medical – Examination	Peer institutions	Class of 2002
11	Alumni giving rate	Council for Aid to Education, 2002	2002
	<i>OR</i>	Voluntary Support of Education	
	Average undergraduate alumni giving rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2003 edition	2000-2002

Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
		undergraduate degree for whom the institution has a current address. Undergraduate alumni donors made one or more gifts for either current operations or capital expenses during the specified academic year. The alumni giving rate is the number of appropriate donors during a given year divided by the number of appropriate alumni of record. The rates were averaged for 2000 and 2001. (Definition and source used by UMCP & FSU and their peers.)	
12 Total R&D expenditures	National Science Foundation	Expenditures on R&D from federal, state, industry, institutional & other sources. Excludes expenditures in medical science for institutions other than UMB. UMB figures include R&D expenditures <i>only in medical science</i> .	FY2001
13 Total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty	National Science Foundation (R&D \$); AAUP, Faculty Salary Survey (faculty counts); AAMC (for medical faculty for UMB and peers).	Expenditures on R&D from federal, state, industry, institutional & other sources per full-time instructional faculty member at the ranks of professor, associate & assistant professor. Excludes expenditures in medical science for institutions other than UMB. UMB figures are R&D expenditures <i>only in medical science</i> . Faculty are full-time, non-medical instructional faculty from most recent AAUP counts for institutions other than UMB. For UMB and peers, faculty are full-time medical faculty whose assignments are for instruction or research. For UMB, faculty counts are taken from AAMC figures.	FY2001
14 Average annual % growth (5-yr.) in federal R&D expenditures	National Science Foundation	Average annual growth rate in federally financed R&D expenditures over the 5-year period from FY96 through FY2001. Excludes federally financed expenditures in medical science for institutions other than UMB. UMB figures include federally financed R&D expenditures <i>only in medical science</i> .	FY96 - FY2001
15 Number of faculty awards per 100 faculty (5 yrs.)	USM data base (built from national publications and databases) & AAUP	The total number of awards per 100 full-time instructional faculty at the ranks of professor, associate & assistant professor over the 5-year period from 1999 through 2003. Awards counted: Fulbrights, Guggenheims, NEH fellowships, CAREER (Young Investigator) awards, Sloan fellowships. Faculty are full-time, non-medical instructional faculty from most recent AAUP counts.	1999 - 2003

16 INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC PEER PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Bowle

1	% faculty with terminal degrees	College Board Annual Survey of Colleges, 2002-2003	Percentage of full-time faculty who have earned doctorate or terminal degree in their field	Fall 2001
2	Acceptance rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2003 edition	Percentage of freshman applicants who were accepted for admission	Fall 2001
3	Yield rate	College Board Annual Survey of Colleges, 2002-2003	Percentage of freshman applicants who enrolled	Fall 2001
4	Total R&D expenditures per full-time faculty	National Science Foundation and AAUP	Average dollars spent on R&D from federal, state, industry, institutional & other sources per core faculty (full-time tenure and tenure-track faculty)	FY 2001

Coppin

1	% part-time undergraduates of total undergraduate enrollment	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey, 2002	Self-explanatory	Fall 2002
2	% graduate students of total headcount enrollment	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey, 2002	Self-explanatory	Fall 2002
3	Non-auxiliary funds as % of total funds	IPEDS, Finance Survey, FY2002	Total current funds revenues minus revenues from auxiliary enterprises divided by total current funds revenues	FY 2002
4	Average age full-time undergraduate	Embark www.embark.com	Self-explanatory	2002-2003
5	% commuter students	Peterson's www.petersons.com	Percent of students who do not live in college owned housing or dorm	2002-2003

Frostburg				
1	FTE students per full-time instructional faculty	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment Survey, 2002 and AAUP	Self-explanatory. All ranks of faculty included.	Fall 2002
2	Percent of faculty with terminal degree	Peer institutions	The percent of full-time faculty (both tenured/tenure track and contractual) who have earned a doctorate, first professional or other terminal degree	FY 2001
Salisbury				
1	Acceptance rate	U.S. News & World Rpt, America's Best Colleges, 2003 edition	The ratio of admitted first-time, first-year, degree-seeking students to total applicants. Total applicants include students who meet all requirements to be considered for admission AND who were notified of an admission decision.	Fall 2001
2	Percent of faculty with terminal degree	College Board, Annual Survey of Colleges, 2002-2003	The percentage of full-time faculty (both tenured/tenure-track and contractual) who have earned a doctorate, first professional or other terminal degree.	Fall 2001
3	Ratio of FTES to FTEF	IPEDS Peer Analysis System – Fall Enrollment and Fall Staff	The ratio of full-time equivalent students to full-time equivalent faculty. Both numbers are calculated values: FT headcount + 1/3 PT headcount. FTES is derived from the Fall Enrollment Survey, and FTEF is derived from the Fall Staff Survey.	Fall 2001
4	Average high school GPA	U.S. News & World Rpt, America's Best Colleges, 2003 edition	Average high school GPA of all degree-seeking, first-time, first-year freshman students who submitted GPA.	Fall 2001
5	Total state appropriation per FTES	IPEDS Peer Analysis System – FY 2002 Finance and Fall Enrollment 2001	Unrestricted state appropriation divided by FTES. Unrestricted state appropriation is from the Finance Survey, and FTES is derived from the Fall Enrollment Survey. FTES is calculated as FT headcount + 1/3 PT headcount.	FY 2002 state appropriation, Fall 2001 enrollment
Towson				
1	Average high school GPA	U.S. News & World Report	Average high school GPA of all degree-seeking, first-time, first-year (freshman) students who submitted GPA	Fall 2001
2	% undergraduates who live on campus (Residential Students)	U.S. News & World Report	Percentage of all degree-seeking undergraduates enrolled in Fall 2000 who live in college-owned, -operated, or -affiliated housing	Fall 2001

3	Student-to-faculty ratio	U.S. News & World Report	The ratio of full-time equivalent students to full-time equivalent instructional faculty. Undergraduate or graduate student teaching assistants are not counted as faculty.	Fall 2000
4	Selectivity (Acceptance Rate)	U.S. News & World Report	The number of freshmen applicants divided by the number of freshmen admitted	Fall 2001

UB

1	Expenditures for research	IPEDS, Finance Form, Part B, line 2	Total dollars expended for research	FY 2001
2	% part-time of all faculty	IPEDS, Fall Staff, lines 22 and 77	Percentage of faculty who are not employed full-time	Fall 2001

UMB

1	Total medicine research & development spending	AAMC, LCME Annual Medical School Questionnaire		FY 2002
2	Medicine research grants per basic research faculty	AAMC, LCME Annual Medical School Questionnaire		FY 2002
3	Medicine research grants per clinical faculty	AAMC, LCME Annual Medical School Questionnaire		FY 2002
4	Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	Minorities include African-American, Asian, Hispanic, & Native American, but do not include Nonresident Alien or Unknown Race.	Fall 2002
5	Total headcount enrollment	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	All students: undergraduate, graduate, and first professional	
6	Percent graduate & first professional as percent of total headcount	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	Self-explanatory	

UMBC

1	Rank in IT bachelor's degrees awarded	IPEDS completions	Rank among UMBC and its peer institutions. FY2002 Completions. Information technology degrees include the following: Computer & Information Sciences; Computer Programming; Data Processing Tech; Information Sciences & Systems; Computer Systems Analysis; Computer Science; Computer Engineering; Electrical, Electronics &	FY 2002
---	---------------------------------------	-------------------	--	---------

Communication.

FY 2002

Rank among UMBC and its peer institutions. Number of invention disclosures, no matter how comprehensive, counted by institution (AUTM) divided by \$million in R&D expenditures (NSF) from federal, state, industry, institutional & other sources

Fall 2001

Ratio of FTE students to FT faculty (per AAUP based on categories of Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor) for 2001.

UMCP

Most recent rankings published for a particular college, program, or specialty area

Total number of graduate-level colleges, programs, or specialty areas ranked among the top 25 in the nation by one or more of five specified publications in their most recent rankings of that particular college/program/specialty area. Rankings are unduplicated, meaning that not more than one top 25 ranking can be claimed per discipline or specialty area, and the discipline/program data must be comparable across all peer institutions.

Most recent rankings published for a particular college, program, or specialty area

Total number of graduate-level colleges, programs, or specialty areas ranked among the top 15 in the nation in one or more of five specified publications in their most recent rankings of that particular college/program/specialty area. Rankings are unduplicated, meaning that not more than one top 15 ranking can be claimed per discipline or specialty area, and the discipline/program data must be comparable across all peer institutions.

1999-2003

The percent change over five years in the number of faculty holding membership in one of three national academies (American Academy of Arts and Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and National Academy of Sciences), equally weighting the percent change for each of the academies.

Fall 2001

The number of invention disclosures reported by the institution to AUTM, per each \$100 million in TOTAL research and development (R&D) expenditures reported for the institution by NSF.

2 Rank in ratio of invention disclosures to \$million R&D expenditures

AUTM, National Science Foundation

3 Ratio of FTE students/ FT faculty

IPEDS Enrollment Files, AAUP

1 # of graduate-level colleges, programs, or specialty areas ranked among the top 25 in the nation

National Research Council, *U.S. News, The Wall Street Journal, Financial Times, Business Week, Success*

2 # of graduate-level colleges, programs, or specialty areas ranked among the top 15 in the nation

National Research Council, *U.S. News, The Wall Street Journal, Financial Times, Business Week, Success*

3 % change over five years in faculty memberships in national academies

USM database

4 Number of invention disclosures per \$100M in R&D

Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM), National Science

Foundation (NSF)				
5	Number of degrees awarded to African-American Students	IPEDS Completions survey via AAUDE	The number of undergraduate degrees awarded to African-American students	Academic year 2002
UMES				
1	Graduation rates of educationally disadvantaged students	Peer institutions	Percent of full-time, degree-seeking entering freshmen with SAT scores of 900 or less who graduate within 6 years	Fall 2001 (1995 entering freshmen cohort)
2	Graduation rates of economically disadvantaged students	Peer institutions	Percent of full-time, degree-seeking entering freshmen with family incomes of \$30,000 or less who graduate within 6 years	Fall 2001 (1995 entering freshmen cohort)
3	Average passing rates on <u>all</u> certification examinations	Peer institutions	Percent of student passing <u>all</u> certification examinations given at the University	Fall 2001
UMUC				
1	Number of African-Americans of all IT graduates	MAITI report for UMUC; IPEDS completion data for peer institutions	Number of graduates of IT (MAITI) undergraduate programs who are African-American. Programs include computer program (CIP 11.00), computer engineering (CIP 14.09), and electrical engineering (CIP 14.10).	FY 2002
2	% of undergraduate students who are 25 and older	IPEDS, Fall Enrollment survey	Percent of undergraduate students who are older than 25 years of age	Fall 2001
3	Number of post-baccalaureate degrees awarded in technology and business/management fields	IPEDS, Completions survey	Number of post-baccalaureate degrees awarded in technology and business/management fields. Programs include computer program (CIP 11.00), computer engineering (CIP 14.09), electrical engineering (CIP 14.10), management information systems (CIP 52.1201), system networking/telecommunication (CIP 52.1204).	FY 2002
4	Number of worldwide online courses	Peer institutions	Number of courses offered online	FY 2003
5	Number of worldwide online enrollments	Peer institutions	Number of enrollments in online courses	FY 2003

APPENDIX C. MORGAN STATE UNIVERSITY OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS FOR PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
1 Second year retention rate	Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) – Enrollment Information System (EIS), Degree Information System (DIS). US News and World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2003	The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking undergraduates that re-enrolled at the original institution one year after matriculation.	Fall 2000 cohort
2 Second year retention rate of African Americans	MHEC – EIS, DIS. Peer institutions.	The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking African American undergraduates that re-enrolled at the original institution one year after matriculation.	Fall 2000 cohort
3 Second year retention rate of minorities	MHEC – EIS, DIS. Peer institutions.	<i>In this context, the term "minorities" refers to members of the African American, Native American, Asian, and Hispanic student groups.</i> The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking African American, Native American, Asian, and Hispanic undergraduates that re-enrolled at the original institution one year after matriculation.	Fall 2000 cohort
4 Six year graduation rate	MHEC – EIS, DIS. IPEDS, Graduation Rate Survey; NCAA.	The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking undergraduates that graduated from the original institution within six years of matriculation.	Fall 1994 Cohort
5 Six year graduation rate of African Americans	MHEC – EIS, DIS. IPEDS, Graduation Rate Survey; NCAA.	The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking African American undergraduates who graduated from the original institution within six years of matriculation.	Fall 1994 Cohort
6 Six year graduation rate of minorities	MHEC – EIS, DIS. IPEDS, Graduation Rate Survey; NCAA.	<i>In this context, the term "minorities" refers to members of the African American, Native American, Asian, and Hispanic student groups.</i> The percentage of first-time, full-time degree seeking African American, Native American, Asian, and Hispanic undergraduates who graduated from the	Fall 1994 Cohort

Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
7 Percent increase in doctoral degrees awarded over base year FY1999	Morgan State University (MSU) DIS.	original institution within six years of matriculation. Self-explanatory	
8 Graduate/Professional school going rate	IPEDS, Postsecondary Completions. MSU/MHEC follow-up survey of graduates. Peer institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions.	The percentage of bachelor's degree recipients who enrolled in graduate or professional school within one year of graduation. <i>Appropriate Maryland institutions refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.</i>	FY 2000 bachelor's degree recipients
9 Student satisfaction with advanced studies preparation	MSU/MHEC follow-up survey of graduates Peer institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions	The percentage of bachelor's degree recipients who enrolled in graduate or professional school within one year of graduation and who rated their preparation for advanced education as excellent, good, or adequate (fair) preparation for their job. <i>Appropriate Maryland institutions refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.</i>	FY 2000 bachelor's degree recipients
10 Student satisfaction with job preparation.	MSU/MHEC follow-up survey of graduates. Peer institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions.	The percentage of bachelor's degree recipients employed full-time within one year of graduation and who rated their education as excellent, good, or adequate (fair) preparation for their job. <i>Appropriate Maryland institutions refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.</i>	FY 2000 bachelor's degree recipients
11 PRAXIS II pass rate	HEA Title II: Aggregate and Summary Institution- Level Pass Rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program. Peer Institutions or	Number of completers who successfully completed one or more tests across all categories used by the State for licensure and the total pass rate. <i>Appropriate Maryland institutions refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.</i>	2000-2001 academic year

Measure	Source of peer data appropriate Maryland institutions.	Operational definition	Date Used
12 Employer satisfaction	MSU Survey Employers. Peer institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions.	Average of nine dimensions of employers' rating of satisfaction with Morgan alumni. <i>Appropriate Maryland institutions</i> refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.	FY 2000 bachelor's degree recipients
13 Alumni giving	MSU Development Office. Peer institutions or appropriate Maryland institutions.	Percent of Morgan's graduates who made contributions to the University during a fiscal year. The base for deriving the percentage is the total number of Morgan graduates for whom <i>good</i> contact information is available <i>Appropriate Maryland institutions</i> refer to Maryland institutions that are in the same Carnegie classification as Morgan State University.	Most current data available
14 Percent growth in grants and contracts (research) expenditures over base of FY1990	MSU Budget Office. IPEDS Peer institutions.	Self-explanatory	

APPENDIX D. ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OF MARYLAND OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS FOR PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

	Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
1	Amount of total R&D spending, FY 2003	IPEDS Finance Report	Current funds expenditures on research	FY 2003
2	Percent of Faculty with Terminal Degrees	US News and World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2003 edition	Percentage of full-time faculty who hold a terminal degree	2003
3	Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank	Academe, March-April 2002 edition	Average salary of full-time instructional faculty by rank	spring, 2002
4	Percentile of full-time instructional faculty salary by rank	Academe, March-April 2002 edition	Interpolated percentile of average full-time faculty salary as compared to national salaries	spring, 2002
5	Average SAT scores of entering freshmen	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2003 edition	Midpoint of 25 th to 75 th percentiles	fall, 2001
6	25 th - 75 th percentile SAT scores of entering freshmen	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2003 edition	25 th - 75 th percentile SAT total scores of entering freshmen	fall, 2001
7	Acceptance rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2003 edition	Percentage of fall 2001 applicants who were admitted	fall, 2001
8	Yield ratio	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2003 edition	Percentage of fall 2001 admitted applicants who ultimately enrolled	fall, 2001
9	Second year retention rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2003 edition	Percentage of first-time, full-time degree-seeking students who re-enrolled the subsequent year	fall, 2000 - fall, 2001
10	Average six-year graduation rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2003 edition	Average six-year graduation rate for all students	1998-2001 (1992, 1993, 1994, 1995 freshman cohorts)
11	Six-year graduation rate for African Americans	Peer institutions	Six-year graduation rate for African-Americans	2002 (1996 cohort)
12	Total headcount enrollment	2001 IPEDS fall enrollment report	Total of all students (including graduate students) enrolled at an institution	fall, 2001
13	Percent minorities of total headcount enrollment	2001 IPEDS fall enrollment report	Percentage of minorities of the total enrollment with race known, non resident aliens are excluded	fall, 2001
14	Percent of full-time undergraduates of total	2001 IPEDS fall	Percentage of undergraduate students who are	fall, 2001

Measure	Source of peer data	Operational definition	Date Used
undergraduates	enrollment report	enrolled full-time	
15 Percent undergraduates of total headcount enrollment	2001 IPEDS fall enrollment report	Percentage of an institution's total enrollment that is undergraduate	fall, 2001
16 Annual tuition and fees for full-time resident undergraduate	2001 IPEDS Institutional Characteristics, Part D	Annual tuition and fees for full-time in-state undergraduate student	fall 2001
17 Percent of full-time freshmen receiving aid from federal government	2001 IPEDS Student Financial Aid	Percentage of full-time freshmen receiving federal grant aid	FY 2001
18 E&G expenditures per FTES	2001 IPEDS Finance Report, IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Survey, Part E	FY 2001 total education and general expenditures and transfers divided by fall 1999 full-time equivalent students (undergraduate credit hour activity divided by 15)	FY 2001, Fall, 1999
19 Average alumni giving rate	U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2003 edition	Percentage of solicited alumni who gave to an institution	2000-2001
20 Tuition and fees revenue as percent of E&G expenditures	2001 IPEDS Finance Report	Current funds revenues from tuition and fees as a percent of FY 2001 total education and general expenditures and transfers	FY 2001
21 Ratio of FTES to full-time faculty	2000 IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Survey, Part E, U.S. News & World Report, America's Best Colleges, 2003 edition	Fall 1999 FTE students (undergraduate credit hour activity divided by 15) divided by the number of fall 2001 full-time faculty	fall, 1999 fall, 2001
22 Academic library holdings	Peterson's Website	Number of titles, serial subscriptions, and audiovisual materials	
23 Academic library expenditures per FTES	1997 IPEDS Finance Report, 2000 IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Survey, Part E	FY 1997 academic library expenditures divided by fall 1999 full-time equivalent students	FY 1997 fall, 1999